

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, Dominguez Hills

Professional Services Division

January 14, 2005

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State University, Dominguez Hills. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State University, Dominguez Hills and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Professional
- Designated Subjects Credential
 - Adult Education
- Education Specialist Credentials
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Early Childhood Special Education Internship
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog)
 - Multiple Subject Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship
 - Child Welfare and Attendance
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Credential
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog)
 - Single Subject Internship

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted
- California State University, Dominguez Hills be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Dominguez Hills be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2011-2012 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

California State University-Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) is an urban public comprehensive university awarding degrees through the Master's and Specialist level. It is one of 23 campuses in the California State University system. The CSUDH College of Education is third in the 23-campus CSU system in producing baccalaureate candidates who pursue a teaching credential. CSUDH is located in the city of Carson on the historic Rancho San Pedro, the oldest Spanish land grant in the Los Angeles area. The 346-acre campus is strategically positioned in the southwestern Los Angeles County Basin with the city of Los Angeles to the north and the beach cities to the west and south in the heart of a major technological, industrial, transportation, and entertainment complex. It is a designated Hispanic-Serving Institution and is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The city of Carson is home to a vital multi-ethnic and multilingual community dedicated to urban and business renewal. Like many cities in the South Bay, Carson was adversely affected by the collapse of the aerospace industries in the early 1990s and has spent the last decade revitalizing and diversifying its economic base. The demographic composition of Carson is 26 percent White, 25 percent African American, 34.9 percent Hispanic, 22 percent Asian, three percent Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and .2 percent Native American/Native Alaskan with a total population of 89,730.

The first candidates were enrolled at CSUDH in the fall of 1965 after the state legislature approved the institution in 1960. Current student enrollment at CSUDH is 13,504 FTE. According to US News and World Report (2004), CSUDH is the second most diverse campus west of the Mississippi and the most diverse in the state. International students represent 35 different countries. The majority of CSUDH students are graduate students from the southern Los Angeles County area who study in the professional programs offered in the evenings and on weekends. All levels of the institution are committed to a social justice ethic captured by the word “communiversity” to emphasize the role and responsibility of the institution and graduates to contribute to the local community and the service region.

The College of Education (COE) is the unit responsible for the preparation of educators and has experienced continued enrollment growth since 1999 as depicted in Table 1.

Table 1: Enrollment, Annual FTEs of COE from 1999-2004

1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
1751.1	1,926.4	1,989	2319.4	2,371.9

The COE offers professional programs that prepare teachers, curriculum specialists, counselors, school psychologists, technology specialists, and school administrators to work in urban multicultural communities. Programs are designed to meet the needs of undergraduate and graduate students, the majority of whom are first-generation college students. The COE works in conjunction with partnership school districts to support the education mission and goals of the university with a strong emphasis on the preparation of diverse candidates to work with diverse students in urban settings.

The College of Education (COE) at CSUDH serves 37 school districts throughout Los Angeles County. Many of these schools are characterized by their linguistic and cultural diversity, high incidence of poverty, an elevated rate of immigration, and an increasing achievement gap. In contrast, the university also serves affluent coastal communities in south central Los Angeles that are also defined by their linguistic and ethnic diversity. The partner school districts, where the majority of CSUDH graduates are employed have student populations of 61.3 percent Latino, 10.5 percent African American, 17.0 percent White, 7.6 percent Asian, .5 percent Pacific Islander, 2.1 percent Filipino, 0.3 percent American Indian, and .7percent Multiple/No response.

The unit is comprised of the Liberal Studies Program, the Teacher Education Division and the Graduate Education Division. The unit offers an undergraduate degree, initial credential programs for Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Special Education, and advanced credential programs for Pupil Personnel Services and Educational Administration. The Designated Subjects credential is offered through Extended Education. The number of credentials recommended by CSUDH from 1999-2003 is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Five Years Credentials Recommended by the College of Education

Credential Program	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004*
Basic Credentials (Initial)					
Single Subject	244	307	335	329	228
Multiple Subject	799	939	755	897	868
Adult Education	38	65	82	62	52
Total	1081	1311	1172	1288	1148
Specialist (Initial)					
Bilingual/Cross cultural Specialist*	0	1	0	0	0
Early Childhood Development	17	12	36	53	27
Learning Handicapped*	56	29	0	0	0
Mild/Moderate Disabilities	21	59	82	119	158
Moderate/Severe Disabilities	11	24	21	27	33
Severely Handicapped*	13	17	0	1	1
Resource Specialist	35	47	19	18	11
Total	153	189	158	218	230
Service Credentials (Advanced)					
Administrative Services, Preliminary	98	119	132	115	151
Administrative Services, Professional	21	44	63	50	47
Pupil Personnel Services-School Counseling	35	37	38	36	57
Pupil Personnel Services-Psychology	17	21	16	25	25
Total	171	221	249	229	280

*Data collected before the end of AY 03-04.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was a continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) according to the approved protocol. The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 2001. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited participate in reviews that are merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Common Standards are addressed in the context of that response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. California State University, Dominguez Hills exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation

Board requires a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards.) Under the provisions of the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations for review. The state review stands in place of that requirement.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Dr. Lawrence Birch, was assigned to the institution in Fall, 2003, and met with institutional leadership in Spring 2004. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Randall Lindsey, was selected in July 2004. The Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Kay Persichitte, was assigned in April, 2004. On August 31, 2004, the team co-chairs and the staff consultant met with the representatives of CSU, Dominguez Hills to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of eighteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster that would include four NCATE members and two COA members; a Basic Credential Cluster of six members; and a Services Credential Cluster of five members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits. (Unfortunately, in the few days before the visit, a member of the NCATE team members became ill and two of the state team members had unexpected emergencies. Since it was too late to obtain replacement members, the visit co-chairs, the Dean of the College of Education and the Consultant agreed to conduct the visit with a smaller team of fifteen.)

The COA Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the COA/NCATE Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the

University's responses to the NCATE Standards/Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered unit issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, November 13. On Saturday morning, the Team Leader and the COA members of the Common Standards Cluster and CCTC staff began their deliberations with the NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. The Common Standards Cluster began its examination of documents on the campus the rest of Saturday and on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday mid-day, November 14, with a meeting of the team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a poster session and reception on Sunday afternoon to provide an orientation to the institution. This was followed by further meetings of the clusters to prepare for the activities of the next day.

On Monday and Tuesday, November 15 and 16, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution arranged to transport members of the team to various local school sites used for collaborative activities. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the NCATE/Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standard.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The entire team met on Tuesday evening to review the findings and make decisions about the results of the visit. The team discussed each NCATE/Common Standard and decided that the six NCATE standards were fully met, with two areas for improvement identified for purposes of the NCATE report, that Standard 6 was met with one identified area of concern for purposes of the COA report, that all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, and that all program standards were met for all program areas, with the exception that in four of the credential programs, one standard was met with concerns..

The team then made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation.**" The recommendation for "Accreditation" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team and that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation. Following the decision, the team went on to complete the written accreditation report, which was reviewed by the team on Wednesday morning. A draft of the report was presented to the faculty late Wednesday morning.

ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

INSTITUTION: California State University, Dominguez Hills

DATES OF VISIT: November 13 – 17, 2004

**ACCREDITATION TEAM
RECOMMENDATION:** ACCREDITATION

RATIONALE:

The accreditation team conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report, program documents, and supporting evidence. In addition, interviews were conducted with candidates in various stages of the programs, program completers who have been in the field for at least one year, faculty staff and administration of the university, employers of graduates, and advisory committee members. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making judgements about the educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University, Dominguez Hills and all of its credential programs was determined based on the following:

NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilized the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement or concern.

PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for Basic credentials and Services credentials reviewed all data regarding those credential programs. Appropriate input was provided by other team members to each of the clusters. Following discussion of each program the total team, NCATE and COA members, considered whether the program standards were either met, met with concerns, or not met.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six(6) NCATE Standards were met, with two identified areas for improvement for purposes of the NCATE report, that Standard 6 was met with one identified area of concern for purposes of the COA report, that all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, and that all Program Standards were met for all program areas, with the exception that in four of the credential

programs, one standard was met with concerns. This accomplishment was made in a period of time when a transition to newly designed programs, changes in college leadership, and budget reductions were occurring. During this period of time, faculty maintained their strong commitment to program excellence, diversity goals, student needs, and collaborative relationships with public schools and colleagues within the university. It is clear that the institution administration has been strongly supportive of faculty efforts and provided appropriate leadership to the college during this time of change.

ACCREDITATION TEAM

State Team Leader: **Randall Lindsey** (Team Co-Chair)
California Lutheran University

NCATE Team Leader **Kay Persichitte**, (Team Co-Chair and
Common Standards Cluster Leader)
University of Wyoming

Common Standards Cluster:

Philip Ginnetti (NCATE Member)
Youngstown State University (Ohio)

Jane H. Applegate (NCATE Member)
University of South Florida

Yvonne Lux (CCTC/COA Member)
California Lutheran University

Mark Cary (CCTC/COA Member)
Davis Joint Unified School District

Basic Credential Cluster:

Chuck Zartman, (Cluster Leader)
California State University, Chico

Beth Bythrow
Los Angeles Unified School District

David Simmons
Ventura County Office of Education

Linda Smetana
California State University, Hayward

Services Credential Cluster:

Marian Reimann, (Cluster Leader)
Los Angeles Unified School District (Retired)

Angela Louque
California State University, San Bernardino

Loretta Whitson
Monrovia Unified School District

Shane Jimerson
University of California, Santa Barbara

Marilyn Cothran
Simi Valley Unified School District

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae

Portfolios
 Candidate Work Samples
 Exit Surveys
 Assessment Data
 Technology Matrix
 Course Materials

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stand. Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	10	35	62	34	141
Institutional Administration	8	20	8	4	40
Candidates	10	56	125	95	286
Graduates	2	31	35	45	113
Employers of Graduates		3	18	23	44
Supervising Practitioners		10	31	20	61
Advisors		5	19	6	30
School Administrators		4	14	36	54
Credential Analyst		2	3	2	7
Advisory Committee		10	5	27	42

TOTAL 818

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings

Content knowledge for teacher candidates

In California, all pre-service teacher candidates are required to meet the subject matter content requirement by completing a state approved subject matter preparation program, or pass a state approved examination, the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) in their content areas. Effective July, 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) required all Multiple Subject Credential candidates to meet the subject matter content requirement by passing the CSET. All other initial teaching credential candidates (Single Subject and Education Specialist [Special Education]) continue to have the options of completing a subject matter requirement by approved subject matter preparation program or examination. The CCTC requires that the subject matter content requirement must be completed prior to student teaching. Institutions within the California State University system are now requiring completion of the subject matter content requirement prior to admission to basic (initial) credential programs.

Currently there is no test score data related to subject matter knowledge available for CSUDH candidates. Therefore, the NCATE 80 percent rule does not yet apply to this California institution. All subject matter programs are aligned with the California Content Standards for K-12 and are approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Advanced Programs require that candidates have earned GPAs from 2.75 to 3.0 reflecting competence in subject matter. The state program review process assures that candidates who have completed approved programs at CSUDH have met the content knowledge standard as specified by the CCTC.

In California, the CCTC assumes the responsibility for program review and approval. Institutions are not required to submit NCATE Program Recognition Reports and the CSUDH unit has chosen to conduct program review by CCTC simultaneous with the NCATE site review. Table 2 summarizes the decisions made as a result of the program review process conducted by the state. Team members who reviewed credential programs within the CCTC Program Standards found the content knowledge to be met for both basic (initial) and services (advanced) programs. None of the unit's programs are accredited by another accrediting agency.

The CCTC requires each California teacher preparation unit to develop an assessment system that assesses candidates on the 13 California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). CSUDH has developed additional assessments to meet the requirements of the Teacher

Performance Assessment System (TPAS). This Unit Assessment System (UAS) includes instruments that assess candidate performance related to content knowledge for student teachers and university interns. The assessments are performance tasks that have been in use since fall, 2003. Table 8 provides the mean scores on content related candidate performance.

Table 8: Mean Scores on Content Related Candidate Performance, Fall 2003-Spring 2004

	Phase I		Phase II	
	N	Mean score	N	Mean score
TPE # 1A: Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills	92	3.67	188	3.63
TPE # 4: Making Content Accessible	N/A	N/A	188	3.61

Interviews confirmed the content knowledge verification process that had occurred prior to the new state testing mandate that went into effect this past spring. All candidates must now demonstrate content knowledge prior to admission into a credentialing program in response to a decree by the Chancellor of the California State University System.

Follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate that both graduates and their employers are satisfied with their knowledge of subject matter. Table 9 compares graduates' perceptions and employers' perceptions on the CSU system-wide survey conducted by the Chancellor's Office. The trend data in this table illustrates consistent improvement as well as favorable comparison with the average system candidate performance.

Table 9: Selected Items from the CSU Chancellor's Survey: Rate (%) of Agreement

Effectiveness of Candidate Preparation												
Items	CSUDH						CSU System					
	2001		2002		2003		2001		2002		2003	
As a new teacher, I was able	SP	CC	SP	CC	SP	CC	SP	CC	SP	CC	SP	CC
To know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at my grade level(s).	78	68	96	79	88	76	75	65	88	76	89	82

SP= Supervisor (employer) CC=Credential Candidate

Content knowledge of other school personnel

There are no required state credential exams related to content knowledge for other school personnel. California does not require content area examinations specifically for other school personnel. Content knowledge of advanced credential programs is demonstrated through state program reviews. Under new "2042" credentialing requirements (recent state legislation) all candidates must have taken and passed a content knowledge test prior to admission to a credentialing program. The CSET will be the required content knowledge state exam in the future. All advanced credential programs have been reviewed and approved by CCTC. State team members reviewing programs for other school personnel (Educational Administration, School Counseling, School Psychology and Pupil Personnel Services) judged content preparation of candidates in these programs to be sufficient.

Other performance data are collected through required courses in advanced programs. Assessment methods vary within these courses and may include research papers, portfolios, presentations, case studies and examinations. Rubrics designed by faculty members are being used to score these assessments. None of the programs offered for other school personnel are recognized by other accrediting bodies. State team members who interviewed graduates and candidates of these programs found the graduates and current candidates very conversant about the subject matter in their programs (see Table 10).

The program prepared me:	Agree Percentage (%)				
	CUR	MUL	EAD	PPSSC	PPSSR
With content knowledge necessary to perform my job.	62	76	85	91	63
To understand the foundation of my discipline.	71	73	95	81	75
Selected Items from Graduate Education Data from TBE Candidate Exit Surveys Aggregate, from 2001 through 2004					
The program prepared me:					
Have knowledge of computer operations for Windows.					
Have knowledge of computer operations for Macintosh.					

Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers

Candidates' pedagogical content knowledge at the basic credential level is assessed through rubric-driven course assignments called "signature assignments." These assignments are designed to give candidates an opportunity to demonstrate a range of teaching abilities related to the content they will be teaching. Curriculum frameworks and national professional standards have been used to shape the nature of the signature assignments embedded in methods courses. These assignments are graded by course instructors and become a part of the course grade. Samples of these assignments and their rubrics were provided for review. A candidate's GPA, then, is the primary indicator of competence. In addition, student teacher and university intern assessment instruments also examine candidate pedagogical content knowledge. Data were provided for two semesters of the ratings provided by university supervisors (see Table 11). Initial program candidates also complete surveys that self-assess pedagogical knowledge (see Table 12). Table 12 provides data aggregated over four years to indicate candidates' relative confidence on five items related to pedagogical content knowledge.

N/O= Not Observed	Phase I		Phase II	
TPE Item	N	Mean Score	N	Mean Score
TPE # 1A: Subject-Specific Pedagogical Skills	92	3.67	188	3.63
TPE # 4: Making Content Accessible	N/O	N/O	188	3.61
TPE # 6: Developmentally Appropriate Practices	N/O	N/O	188	3.49

Table 12: Selected Items from Teacher Education Candidate Exit Surveys Aggregates, 2000-2004

Percent of agreement of Teacher Preparation (CSTP Domains)	
The program prepared me to:	Agree %
2. Engage students in problem solving, critical thinking, and other activities that make subject matter meaningful.	75
5. Organize curriculum to support student understanding of subject matter.	73
6. Select and use instructional strategies that are appropriate to subject matter.	76
7. Draw on and value students' backgrounds, interests, prior knowledge, and developmental learning needs.	77
15. Use appropriate technologies to make subject matter accessible to students.	67

Presentation of content in clear and meaningful ways is assessed through fieldwork, student teaching and university internships. The Program Handbook that is given to all candidates describes in detail the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) particularly under the heading “Making Content Accessible.” However because these TPEs are just being implemented through the new “2042” credential, data are currently being collected to document how candidates in the various programs are performing relative to this TPE. 2004-05 is the pilot year for implementing these revisions to the instrumentation of the UAS.

Candidates integrate technology in their teaching. These skills are demonstrated through implementation of the COE Technology Plan. In 1999, specific outcomes for candidates were developed that align with ISTE standards.

The COE Technology Plan was evaluated by the faculty and updated in 2004. Technology has been integrated into the majority of the professional education courses. TED 420 requires that candidates complete a basic technology literacy examination.

Interviews with candidates and graduates indicate that the pedagogical knowledge component of the initial credential programs is very strong. Candidates spoke about the rigor of the “signature assignments” and the reflective essays that are required in all professional courses. Results from surveys (see Table 13) show satisfaction among graduates and employers on items related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills that compares favorably to the system-wide data.

Table 13: Selected Items about Pedagogical Content Knowledge from Advanced Program Graduate and Employer Surveys Aggregate, 2002- 2003

The program prepared me:	CUR		MUL		PER		TBE		PPSSC		PPSSP		EAD	
% agreement	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E
With knowledge and skills to develop as a professional.	85	94	73	100	82	72	60	100	87	80	73	75	57	84
To utilize technology effectively in my profession.	45	63	52	75	88	58	80	100	42	60	45	100	33	67

Legend: G=Graduates % agreement; E=Employers % agreement

Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers

Review of program documents for basic credentials during this visit judged candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge to be a strength of the credential programs. Candidates acquire professional and pedagogical knowledge through their professional education coursework that includes two phases. Prerequisite courses in the initial phase of the program focus on contemporary and traditional aspects of teacher education.

Phase II, MS (elementary) or SS (secondary) candidates apply for either their student teaching or university internship and then get permission to register for methods courses. Successful completion of both phases requires candidates to meet pre-specified performance levels on a variety of rubrics within the UAS.

No assessment data were available to demonstrate that advanced-level candidates in the M.A. Teaching/Curriculum program have professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills related to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. CSUDH does offer two courses geared toward National Board Certification, GED 555 (Introduction to National Board Certification) and GED 556 (Analytical Teaching Portfolio Development). These courses may be used as electives in the M.A. in Education Degree, Teaching/Curriculum Option.

It is evident by virtue of the institution's location and mission that educating teachers and other professionals for urban schools is a dominant focus and course syllabi indicate the conceptual framework is consistently articulated in courses. Candidates are regularly required in coursework to reflect on their work and experiences.

Interviews with candidates, and university supervisors indicated that candidates are well prepared in professional and pedagogical knowledge. One long-term supervisor noted the changes in the quality of the beginning teachers he has observed over time noting that the teachers he observes today are well prepared in all aspects of teaching (see Table 14).

Table 14: Selected Items from Teacher Education Data from Graduate and Employer Surveys Aggregates, 2002-2003

Rating (%) of Teacher Preparation-MS/SS (CSTP Items)		
The program prepared me to:	G	E
	Agree %	
1. To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations.	75	82
2. With the necessary skill to perform my job.	67	79
3. To organize and manage an educational setting.	57	77
4. To be confident, responsive, and supportive in interactions with parent and community.	44	75
6. To meet the standards in the profession.	66	72
8. To be effective at promoting student learning.	68	76

Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel

State team members reviewed program documents for professional knowledge and skills and found the documents to indicate a strong base for developing professional knowledge and skills consistent with state standards for the appropriate credential programs. Other performance data are embedded in coursework and fieldwork for other school personnel. Candidates use case studies, professional work samples, portfolios, notebooks and journals as vehicles for data collection and analysis. Advanced candidates' exit surveys provide documentation of this standard element (see Table 15).

Table 15: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Demonstrated by Advanced Teaching Candidates in the M.A. Programs

Program	Examples of Pedagogical Content Knowledge Performance Courses
Multicultural	MUL 520: The Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages; MUL 525: Bilingual-Multicultural Teaching Methods
Teaching/Curriculum	CUR 515: Seminar In Curriculum Development In Reading And The Language Arts; CUR 516: Seminar In Curriculum Development In Science and Math; CUR 517: Seminar In Curriculum Development In the Humanities and Social Sciences
Technology-Based Education	TBE 560: Preparing Computer Assisted Instruction; TBE 570: Computer Assisted Instruction Final Project
Physical Education Administration Option	PED 514: Seminar in Curriculum development in Physical Education

Interviews with candidates and graduates indicated a high degree of satisfaction with professional knowledge and skills. Both noted the value of the faculty in providing guidance and direction in the practical aspects of professional knowledge related to their new careers. Exit surveys and graduate/employer surveys provide evidence of candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Aggregated data for each of the advanced programs document high satisfaction rates.

Dispositions

Dispositions are described in the Conceptual Framework section of this document. Dispositions are not different for the initial and advanced candidates. Assessment of dispositions as specified in the CF is a relatively new practice at CSUDH. In spring of 2004, an assessment instrument was designed and piloted to assess the dispositions for the unit and align them with the revised CF. The instrument is consistent with the eight attributes outlined and the results from the pilot indicate that candidates believe that they have the responsibility to display these desired professional behaviors. Data are not yet available for the assessment of dispositions by supervising teachers and K-12 principals.

Assessment of dispositions is articulated in the current program handbook that is given to candidates in basic credential programs. This handbook also describes all other forms of assessment required. Candidates are informed about dispositions in classes and syllabi contain statements about the CF. An assortment of artifacts including candidates' reflective essays across their professional preparation have dispositions embedded in them.

Faculty members are quick to acknowledge the importance of the urban mission of the institution and the values associated with providing safe and constructive educational opportunities for all children and youth. Other school partners easily articulated an understanding and expectation for the application of the CF within candidate practice. The previous graduate and employer surveys from 2002-2003 did provide data about three dimensions of the dispositions (see Table 16 for initial credentials and Table 17 for advanced programs).

Table 16: Selected Items from Graduate and Employer Surveys 2002-2003

Graduate and Employer Responses				
The program prepared me to:	Educational Specialist		Teacher Education	
Items	G	E	G	E
To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations.	71	70	74	82
To be confident, responsive, and supportive in interactions with parents and community.	69	53	44	75
To meet the standards of my profession.	81	75	68	72

Table 17: Rating of (%) Selected Items Pertaining to Candidates' Dispositions from Advanced Candidates' Exit Data from Exit Survey Aggregate, 2001-2004

Items	CUR	MUL	TBE	PPSSC	PPSSP	EAD
To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations.	58	79	66	87	72	85
To be confident, responsive, and supportive in interactions with parents and community.	52	71	N/A	85	45	77
To meet the standards of my profession.	66	73	N/A	87	63	84

Student learning for teacher candidates

Review of program documents, interviews with supervising teachers, and K-12 building administrators reported that candidates have a positive effect on student learning. They reported a deep commitment of CSUDH candidates to creating adapted learning environments with differentiated instruction to help all students learn. Candidates (as reported in interviews) regularly use a variety of assessments with students and are conscientious about using assessment data in their reflections of lesson improvement and professional growth.

Because state standards speak directly to the three domains of learning addressed in this standard through CSTP Standard 3, CSTP Standard 4 and CSTP Standard 5, attention to assessing student learning, using assessments in instruction and developing meaningful learning experiences are embedded in all professional and pedagogical coursework. These CSTP standards, like other state standards are assessed using a variety of formative and summative tools previously described for credential programs. Those non-credential programs at the advanced level (Teaching/Curriculum, Technology Based Education, and Multicultural) are not reviewed under credentialing standards.

Interviews of candidates indicated that candidates are well prepared in a variety of assessment strategies. Anecdotes from candidates were rich in descriptions of the varied and frequently difficult learning environments in their various school assignments which call forth the skills involved in differentiating instruction so all children can learn. Several candidates described specific classroom challenges in the teaching of reading to children whose second language is English and the candidates described a range of approaches they had learned to modify and assess reading competence.

Student learning for other school personnel

Review of program documents indicated that attention to student learning and creating a positive environment conducive to student learning was evident in all programs. State credentialing requirements guide the development of curriculum and field experiences in these programs. Candidates produce a variety of documents such as case studies, projects, work samples, professional notebooks and portfolios. These documents illustrate a variety of applications and strategies for creating positive learning environments for students.

Interviews of candidates and graduates verified that creating a positive learning environment in an urban, diverse school environment is expected in their coursework and their fieldwork. Table 18 provides an item from the Graduate and Employer Surveys (2002-2003) that addresses the impact on student learning.

Table 18: Selected Items from Graduate and Employer Surveys 2002-2003

Graduate (G) and Employer (E) Responses														
Programs	CUR		MUL		PER		TBE		PPSSC		PPSSP		EAD	
The program prepared me: % Agreement	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E
To be effective at promoting student learning	85	75	81	100	75	72	80	100	76	87	45	100	56	81

Overall Assessment of Standard

Assessment data provided by the unit through entry, program transition points and credential awards, and through follow-up surveys and employment surveys indicate that candidates possess the requisite content and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet state requirements and unit expectations. Faculty members and unit staff clearly described their expectations for basic and advanced credential candidates. Candidates and graduates confirmed that they learned much from their respective preparation programs. Advanced programs not connected to California credentials presented limited performance data related to the effectiveness of their programs.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement:

New: The Master of Arts in Teaching/Curriculum program does not document any alignment with candidate assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to meet the propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Rationale: There is no evidence that the propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards have been incorporated into the curriculum, pedagogical content knowledge, or field experience requirements for credentialed teachers in this advanced program.

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings

Assessment System

The unit has a fully operational Unit Assessment System (UAS) that was created and approved by the COE Evaluation Committee and members of its professional community in spring 2000. Since that initial work, both the unit assessment plan and the UAS have continued to evolve through consistent examination of the validity and utility of information produced through evaluation and assessment. Modifications to the plan and the system are based on the results of these analyses and input from faculty and staff. The unit assessment plan and the UAS reflect the unit's CF and provide data to the unit decision-making process regarding program improvement and candidate performance at critical transition points. Candidate performance measures are

based on proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. The current unit assessment plan includes projections for specific assessments and overall program evaluation for the next five years.

More specifically, and in keeping with the COE's mission, vision, philosophy, goals, and objectives, the UAS is woven into every element of the program. The design of the UAS considers carefully the unit's intent to prepare highly qualified *Reflective Urban Professionals* in initial and advanced programs to work in urban settings with learners and others from diverse backgrounds. A critical aspect of each assessment is to provide evidence across programs on candidates' dispositions as well as their knowledge, skills, and use of technology. Similarly, data gathered from program and unit level assessments provide evidence regarding faculty perceptions of how the unit is addressing issues related to curriculum; candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions; diversity and the use of technology. [See data tables throughout this report.]

Input to the plan has come from the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning, University Testing Office, Center for Teaching and Learning; various faculty activities (retreats, division/program meetings, committee/task force meetings, and various advisory board meetings); monthly oversight by the COE Evaluation Committee and the COE Evaluation Center (EVC). Such continuous collaboration ensures multiple perspectives so that no single assessment is developed without the consideration of all other assessments. This process also ensures that elements of the CF are reflected in all assessments.

The COE Evaluation Committee oversees the creation and review of assessment instruments and procedures. This committee is comprised of program faculty, coordinators, and staff, as well as EVC staff. The Evaluation Committee carefully reviews each assessment instrument used to gather data to ensure that instruments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. As part of its function, the Evaluation Committee continually reviews results of assessments and monitors the correlation between program changes and assessment results. In addition, the COE Teaching and Learning Center is designing a process in which program faculty can receive training and credit for conducting comparative studies of student outcomes as they relate to specific changes in course content and/or methods. Data collected by the COE on candidates and graduates by program faculty, fieldwork supervisors, and employers is reported along with candidates' self-reported data, and the EVC is currently working on ways to triangulate data among these different sources to provide further comparison.

Table 19 summarizes the sources of assessment evidence, the level(s) at which they are collected, and frequency or transition points of data collection.

Table 19: Sources of Assessment Evidence Related to NCATE Standards

Standard	Source of Evidence	Level *	Transition Points/ Frequency
CF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty work at Spring and Fall retreats (2001-2004): review of COE Knowledge base, Goals and Objectives, Philosophy and Beliefs Committee work: Knowledge Base, Conceptual Framework design, COE Evaluation Committee/EVC work on aligning assessments to Conceptual framework 	COE	Annually Ongoing Ongoing
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrance Criteria (GPA, U. S. Constitution, CBEST, CSET/Subject Matter Verification, BCLAD oral fluency, ID Clearance, Recommendations, Interviews) Course assignments/examinations (signature assignments written projects/exams, class/field performance-based projects w/rubrics) Standards/Performance-based and Competencies assessments (acceptable GPA, formative course/field assessments--TED TPAS, clinical/field observations) Self-Report survey of candidates perception on their Professional Development preparation Self-Report of candidates perceptions of preparation (KSD) on Exit survey Exit Criteria (RICA, Masters Thesis/Examinations, Reflective Essays, Technology course, Field Portfolios, BCLAD oral and cultural examinations) 	I/A I I/A I/A I/A I/A I/A	Program Entrance Coursework each Semester Coursework each Semester End of Course Program Exit Program Exit
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple formative and summative assessments Course assessments (development of rubrics) Field assessments (observation evaluations & interview protocols w/rubrics) Unit, division, and program surveys (Diversity, Technology, Faculty, Staff, Program Exit, Field Experience, Graduate/Employer), CSU System-wide Chancellor's survey (cross comparisons for graduates/employers) Data analysis, reports, presentations Program improvements described in annual reports 	I/A I/A I/A Unit I I/A I/A	Semester Semester Field Exp. Semester/ Annually Spring On-going Annual
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field application processes University supervisor/school-site personnel Observations/Evaluations (master teachers, administrative designee) TED Teacher Performance Expectations field assessments w/Rubrics Special Education Competencies assessment w/Rubrics GED Performance Competencies assessment w/Rubrics Field Experience Portfolios w/rubrics Student work samples analysis w/rubrics Passing grade in Field Experience 	I/A I/A I I I/A I/A I/A	Field Entrance Field Experience Field Experience Field Experience Field Experience Field Experience Field Exit
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment/Hiring Practices Diversity issues covered in course assignments with rubrics Diversity Committee Diversity Survey (faculty, staff) Diversity items on Candidate surveys (Program Exit, Graduates, Employers), and university/school-site personnel surveys (supervisors and master teachers) 	Unit I/A Unit Unit I/A	On-going On-going On-going Annually Exit from program
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application process Hiring interview w/ lesson demonstration Perceived Teaching Effectiveness evaluation Retention, Tenure, & Promotion process Research in education field Publications (articles, books, manuals, reports) Presentations (local, national, international) Service (division, unit, university, community) 	I/A I/A Unit Unit Unit Unit Unit Unit	On-going On-going End of Course Annually On-going On-going On-going On-going
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning, Center for Teaching and Learning, Testing Office, COE administration, faculty, staff and COE Advisory Board developed collaboratively the UAS to assess candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions described in NCATE, institutional, state, and national standards COE Evaluation Committee (representatives from all divisions and programs) oversees all evaluation and assessment efforts) COE Evaluation Center and Director of Evaluation (implement evaluation at unit, division, program, and project level--assessment development, data collection and analysis, data management/tracking systems, coordination of data flow from university and other sources, presentations, reports) Division chairs and Program coordinators implement program changes based on data 	Unit Unit Unit Unit	On-going On-going On-going Annually

* I=Initial and A=Advanced Programs

COE Unit Assessment System (UAS)

Documenting the value of the program and course instruction that directly impacts candidates' competence is another critical element of the UAS. Candidate competence is promoted through systematic monitoring of candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and dispositions throughout their education preparation. A key component of the UAS is ensuring that relevant data are collected systematically, analyzed rigorously, interpreted accurately, communicated effectively, and used appropriately for program improvement.

This formal assessment system, designed to ensure the most efficient use of time and/or resources, maximizes program effectiveness and consists of:

- grounding in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions as defined by the CF;
- unit and program self-studies for both NCATE and CCTC;
- multiple and varied (formative, summative, informal, and formal) assessments at critical transition points (course work, clinical and field experiences, and P-K setting) for both initial and advanced programs;
- data collection, analysis, and interpretation related to the CF and all six NCATE Standards;
- electronic data management system;
- monitoring candidate's progress (at program entrance, during the program, and program exit);
- training faculty and staff on assessment processes;
- implementation of program improvements based on assessment data; and
- preparing data for presentations and annual reports.

Assessment Processes

Based on the COE beliefs that there is no one indicator of effectiveness for any element of the NCATE and CCTC standards, the UAS implements multiple measures to assess each element of each standard. Furthermore, triangulation of data collected assesses the elements from different perspectives, in various contexts, and at regularly scheduled intervals. This type of analysis allows the COE to view our candidates and programs from a variety of perspectives and to base program modification and refinement on multiple sources of data. The use of effective multiple internal and external measures is intended to eliminate bias and ensure that assessment procedures are fair, accurate, and consistent.

Multiple assessments sources for candidates at critical transition points include:

- entrance criteria;
- standard and performance based evaluation of candidates' course and field experiences;
- comparative data analysis (COE and school site data) of candidate's performance in P-12 settings during field/clinical practice;
- course assignments with rubrics that assess candidates' content/pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions and their reflection about their knowledge, skills, and dispositions;
- candidates' perceptions of their preparation to perform the standards of their profession effectively upon exiting the program and after one to two years in their field;
- exit criteria;
- employers' evaluation of graduate performance; and
- comparative data analysis (COE and state CSU) of initial graduates' perception and their employers' assessment of graduates' performance.

Multiple assessments sources for the unit/programs include:

- candidates' perceptions about services and resources they received at the unit, program, and university levels;
- candidates' evaluation of faculty (University Perceived Teaching Effectiveness survey);
- candidates, faculty, and staff perceptions about the unit/program effectiveness in dealing with issues of diversity and technology;
- faculty and staff perceptions about the unit's CF and their respective roles/responsibilities as well as perceptions about resources, professional development;
- individual program self-study, assessment plans, and annual reports; and
- input from advisory boards, faculty/staff retreats, and various committees.

The COE admissions office maintains records of candidate progress through each program. Candidates must meet with an advisor each semester prior to registering for classes. Candidates who are not meeting expectations are provided support through a variety of means, including individualized support plans, referral to the CSUDH Student Support Services Program, and supplementary coursework. If a student does not maintain minimum GPA for continuing in the program, he/she is placed on probation for one semester prior to dismissal. If the student continues to perform below standards, he/she is dismissed.

If a student wishes to file a complaint, petition for change of grade, or appeal a COE decision, CSUDH and COE have clearly outlined procedures for addressing student concerns. The COE maintains records of all student petitions and how each is resolved. This was confirmed through a review of documents related to appeals and complaint processes.

Data collection, analysis, and evaluation

The COE assessment system draws from two major data sources. Student demographic data is downloaded from the CSUDH Banner database. This is combined with assessment data gathered by the COE for use in generating reports. The COE employs a programmer analyst to create custom software applications to enable faculty and staff to enter and access a wide range of data. In addition to streamlining the data analysis process, the programmer analyst has created custom applications in response to specific needs and requests from faculty and administration. In addition, the COE employs a computer systems technician to ensure that the data infrastructure in the college is well maintained and integrated with the University system. These staff also work with COE faculty and administration to provide online access to appropriate assessment instruments, data, and reports.

The bulk of data summarization, analysis, and reporting is done by the COE Evaluation Center (EVC). The EVC produces a variety of standard reports for program faculty and administration in addition to creating other reports in response to specific requests. As indicated in Table 19 (above) and section C (below), data are summarized, analyzed, and reported at regular intervals as well as in response to specific needs. The COE Evaluation Committee oversees the work of the EVC and makes recommendations for changes in the assessment process and in the assessment instruments themselves. Evaluation Committee membership includes broad representation from programs within the COE. This ensures that all participants in the assessment system are represented.

The EVC has been operating since 2000, and the COE has a comprehensive plan for reviewing and improving the assessment system over the next several years. The CSUDH Provost has demonstrated a strong commitment to program assessment at all levels. One example of this is in the restructuring of the Office of Institutional Research into an Office of Institutional Research,

Assessment, and Planning. This change acknowledges and supports the notion that assessment is an essential component in effective planning.

Use of data for program improvement

University, unit, and program administrators, project directors, faculty, staff, candidates, and P-12 school representatives have multiple uses for assessment data. The fact that the UAS is multifaceted and integrated is beneficial to candidates and the institution. Whereas the institution, unit, divisions, and programs use data primarily for program improvement and to guide program change, and candidates use the data to document their professional development.

As part of the ongoing review of the UAS, the division chairs produce an annual report based on data gathered throughout the year. These results are shared annually with faculty at the fall retreats. Reporting includes an End-of-Year Report using a standardized template that has been completed each year (2001-2003) by program coordinators. Both division and program reports provide documentation of program improvements in the following three areas:

1. Program statistics:
 - new faculty hires
 - diversity statistics of faculty (full- and part-time, including field supervisors and master teachers) and candidates
 - student enrollments (numbers and percent changes from prior year)
 - number of field placements
 - partnerships within university
 - partnerships outside university
2. Coursework and field experiences:
 - changes/improvements/refinements in courses (as evidenced by changes in course syllabi)
 - changes/improvements/refinements in assessment (e.g., rubrics for assignments and examinations)
 - changes/improvements/refinements in field experiences (e.g., rubrics for competencies evaluation)
 - changes in university (e.g., policies) that impacted program (e.g., reorganization, WASC requirements)
 - changes in unit that had an impact on the program (accreditation requirements for standard/performance based assessment)
 - changes in state (e.g., CCTC reforms) that had an impact on the program (new credential requirements)
 - changes in integration of instructional technology (need to infuse technology in all courses)
 - changes in diversity experiences/requirements/expectations (course/field observations and evaluations)
3. Program strengths and weaknesses and actions planned/taken:
 - Candidate preparation
 - Program services (e.g., program office and Student Services Center)
 - Advising (e.g., faculty and Student Services Center)
 - Faculty (e.g., full and part time, including field supervisors and master teachers)
 - Coursework (e.g., assignments, projects, examinations)

- Field/Clinical experiences (e.g., candidate and school site match)
- Professional development for faculty, staff, and candidates

Although reports are generated by division chairs and program coordinators, faculty input and approval of changes are obtained during faculty, committee, and course meetings. Examination of course syllabi provided clear evidence of changes in course content and/or structure based on assessment data in each program. Pass rates on the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA)—a state-mandated test for the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist credentials—have increased dramatically in the past several years (see Table 20) as program faculty examined pass rates and made changes in reading and language arts course content, structure, and emphasis to align instruction with the domains and focus areas on the test.

Table 20: RICA Passage Rates (%) on MS and Ed Specialist Candidates

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
RICA Passage Rate	73	96	98	95	100

Overall Assessment of Standard

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) developed by the COE provides a comprehensive and systematic means for gathering, analyzing, interpreting, and reporting a wide range of data critical for promoting program improvement and monitoring candidate competence. Under the oversight of the COE Evaluation Committee, and with support from the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning, the UAS is continually being improved and refined. Document review and interviews of program faculty and staff, program candidates and graduates, and employers provide clear evidence that the UAS is an effective system for gathering and reporting data, and that those data are used to guide program changes that support candidates' acquiring the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for success in an urban educational environment.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings

Field experience and clinical practice are integral parts of the unit's initial and advanced programs. Through these experiences, candidates learn to apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions defined in the Conceptual Framework (CF). All programs require candidates to complete some kind of fieldwork, internship, practicum, action research/project or other activity related to P-12 schools. In the initial teaching programs, candidates move through a three-step developmental sequence; observations and reflection, participation and tutoring, and impacting student learning in student teaching/intern fieldwork/or directed teaching. Advanced program candidates complete capstone field experiences such as practice, internships, action research projects or other approved P-12 activity.

Collaboration between unit and school partners—Initial programs

The unit collaborates with its public school district partners to design, deliver and evaluate field and clinical experiences in the initial and advanced programs. These collaborations are formalized through agreements between the COE and school districts. The unit has a contractual understanding with school districts about the procurement and payment of master teachers. The MS, SS, and ES university intern programs have intern agreements with participating school districts. The unit has several memoranda of understanding with school district induction programs. These contracts, agreements, and MOUs specify the responsibilities of the COE and the school districts in student teaching, intern fieldwork, and other clinical placements. Advanced programs have agreements with educational agencies and school district for clinical practice. Professional preparation programs have continuous and sustained conversations with local school districts, their bargaining agents, educational reform agencies, community colleges, subject matter programs, and induction programs.

The COE has collaborative relationships with over 45 public school districts and educational agencies. These collaborations occur in advisory board meetings, IHE/Induction meetings, professional development school sessions, meetings and discussions between university program coordinators and school district administrators, formal training of master teachers and university supervisors, PDS collaborations, and informal interactions at school sites. Formalized mechanisms are in place to involve field practitioners and faculty to design and refine curriculum, review assessment instruments, and evaluate programs are in place.

At the unit level, the COE Advisory Board provides a formal flow of information between local superintendents and the COE about school district needs and the ways in which the COE is designing programs in response to those needs. The COE Advisory Board is composed of stakeholders from the community including school district superintendents, community college

presidents, principals, city representatives and others. An example of a recent collaborative decision is the review of plans for the new educational administrative program.

Since 1988, the TED Advisory Board has guided the university intern program. Representing many constituencies, the board reviews program design, presents candidate and school district needs, comments on program implementation and makes suggestions for review or change. A recent program improvement from this group deliberation has been a change in the way cooperating teachers are remunerated.

Since 1997, the COE has participated in DELTA, a collaborative consisting of educational reform agencies of the Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Project (LAAMP), the Los Angeles Educational Partnership (LAEP), and two school districts: Pasadena Unified School District and Los Angeles Unified School District. This project brought together school districts, the reform agencies (LAAMP & LAEP) and California State Universities in the Los Angeles Basin to recast the relationship between teacher preparation institutions and local school districts so that teacher training would be field-based and teacher professional development would be seamless and continuous. One result of this intensive collaboration has been the establishment of COE professional development schools (PDS) in Los Angeles Unified School District. PDS's have a tripartite governance structure in which regular meetings are held at the policy, guidance, and operations level.

The coordinators of student teaching meet regularly with local school district personnel and site principals to arrange field placements and to get feedback on the student teaching program. The coordinators of professional development schools meet regularly with school district personnel and site administrators to arrange program sites and calendar, recruit new university interns, and get program feedback. Feedback is provided to all programs through master teacher surveys, employer surveys, candidates' surveys and supervisor surveys and through the CSU system-wide survey for initial programs. The unit currently has PDS sites which serve candidates from the following programs: MS, Special Education, and Education Administration. The MS and SS programs have university intern agreements with 45 school districts and special education programs with 29 districts.

The University Committee on Educator Preparation (UCEP) ensures communication and collaboration between CSUDH's academic departments in the content areas represented by faculty in five colleges and the professional teacher preparation program providing for the smooth transition from one program to the next, including the management of field experiences and clinical practice. UCEP, chaired by the vice provost for academic affairs, consists of the deans of the College of Education, College of Arts and Science and Undergraduate Studies, Chair of The Division Of Teacher Education, Liberal Studies Program Coordinator, advisors of the subject matter programs, coordinators of the teacher education programs, and the lead credential analyst. The Council for Liberal Studies and Teacher Education Policies (CLSTEP), chaired by the Dean of the COE, makes policy for all teacher education programs and consists of the deans and the Liberal Studies Program Coordinator. The Liberal Studies Advisory Board ensures collaboration among the colleges who offer the major coursework.

The Chair of the Teacher Education Division serves on the steering committee of two professional induction programs: the Hawthorne, Lawndale, Lennox Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Consortium and the Torrance Unified School District. Through this collaboration, there is a clear process of transition for newly credentialed teachers to enter into

these induction programs. The university preparation program has the responsibility for training new teachers at the preliminary level relative to competencies in mainstreaming, technology, healthy environments, and English learners. Induction programs fulfill this function at the professional clear level. The university and the district induction programs share expertise, facilities, and resources.

Program Coordinators work with the school district designees in each partner district to make student teaching placements. In most districts, this is an administrator from Human Resources, New Teacher Support or Instructional Services. In some districts, the coordinators are directed to a site administrator for the school. In all cases, the coordinator is expected to follow the protocol established by the school district. Sites for field experiences for candidates are selected using criteria that assure thorough, professional preparation for candidates to work in diverse, urban school districts. Candidates are placed in a variety of settings that include diverse populations, including English Learners, students with exceptionalities and developmental ranges. As the data in the introduction indicates diverse settings are the norm for schools in which the unit's placements are made.

Cooperating teachers are selected based on criteria developed in collaboration with the public school administration to provide professional support, assistance, and feedback to candidates during their student teaching experiences. Selection criteria related to professional and personal qualifications include: (a) the teacher's holding of a valid credential in the authorized teaching assignment; (b) the teacher's knowledge of and ability to use state-adopted content standards, curriculum frameworks, and state-approved curricular materials; (c) the teacher's ability to collaborate and communicate effectively with professional colleagues and beginning teachers; (d) the teacher's abilities to teach diverse students effectively; and (e) the teacher's willingness to participate in professional training to develop knowledge and skills necessary to work effectively with candidates.

Initial candidates are evaluated by unit and P-12 field supervisors. Feedback regarding the program comes from candidates, cooperating teachers and/or site administrators through surveys, advisory board meetings or informally through conversations with the coordinators, faculty or the chair. The cooperating teacher observes the student teacher on a regular basis and the university supervisor observes at least four times. The supervisor fills out an observation sheet for each visit and confers regularly with the cooperating teacher. Both complete a final evaluation of the candidate. Both complete a program evaluation form. The candidates evaluate the cooperating teacher and the supervisor. The coordinators review these evaluations and pass the result to the COE Evaluation Center. By training cooperating teachers and supervisors to use the DOTI rubric, outcome variables are clearly articulated. This triangulation of data is designed to ensure a fair and equitable rating of the candidates' performance during field experience.

University interns in CA are teachers of record in one of the unit's intern partner schools completing their credential in an approved teaching credential program. They are supported by a site-based support provider trained through the university support provider program and supervised by a university supervisor and their site-based administrator. The support provider provides mentoring support and formative assessment but does not evaluate the candidate. The university supervisor and the site-based administrator confer regularly and collaborate on the final evaluation.

Advanced Programs

Field experiences at the advanced level are defined as internships, fieldwork or other approved P-12 activity. Since the number of candidates is smaller and placement must be more specific as to the type and location, graduate program coordinators make the placements, assign the supervisors, and supervise the evaluation of the experience. University and site-based supervisors evaluate the candidates.

Candidates nominate their sites and site supervisor, and the nomination is reviewed and approved by university faculty. Candidates are assigned to university faculty per student request whenever possible or by geographic clustering.

The Educational Administration program has a California Department of Education (CDE) school leadership collaborative grant with local administrative districts 6, 7, 8. It piloted the forthcoming new field program, which infused fieldwork throughout the credential program in lieu of an exit course. All professors in the grant address the fieldwork component through their lecture/discipline expertise in coursework. There are 75 candidates currently in the program. There have been 150 successful graduates to date. The program was collaboratively designed by the partners, delivered on site in the school district and taught by school based as well as university faculty. The project is administered by the director of the grant and the three local superintendents. Each candidate is mentored by university or school-based personnel responsible for supporting the candidates' successful completion of 32 field competencies and offering career guidance and support. Candidate progress is measure by the fieldwork assessment instrument.

The School Counseling Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program has a contract with LAUSD for field supervision and internship supervision. Both advanced credential programs utilize field-base competencies to evaluate the field performance of candidates.

Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

The initial and advanced credentialing programs include carefully sequenced series of field experiences going from early field, field-based courses to full day student teaching/directed teaching/fieldwork. As the courses and concurrent field experiences are developmentally sequenced and aligned with institutional, national and state standards, candidates have multiple opportunities to learn and practice these skills within classroom settings. Formative and summative assessment tasks are thoughtfully aligned with the fieldwork experiences to allow candidates to practice and prepare for the summative assessment tasks, which serve as a major demonstration of competency (see Table 21) for credentialing decisions.

Table 21: Field Experience Requirements for Initial Programs

Table 21: Field Experience Requirements for Initial Programs				
Program	Prerequisite Phase	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III (University Intern)
Multiple Subject Exit Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">3.0 Overall rating on the thirteen TPEs with no TPE rating of 1Complete PortfolioSAST rating of 3 (Video, unit plan, student work samples, reflection)	TED 400: field experience requirements for Initial Programs. Table 3.4 summarizes the assessment strategies for each initial Introduction to Education (30 Hours Observation & Participation)	TED 407: Language Learning (Case Study of an English Learner 5 hrs)	TED 404: Elementary Reading Language Arts II (Case Study, 5 hrs of observation of a credentialed reading teacher-Multiple Subject)	
	TED 402: Educational Psychology (10 hrs. Child Observation)	TED 403: Elementary Reading Language Arts I (Case Study, 5 hrs. of observation of a credentialed reading teacher-Multiple Subject)	TED 437: Elementary Student Teaching II (Eleven weeks of student teaching: 264 hrs)	
		TED 434: Elementary Student Teaching I (Eight weeks of student teaching: 192 hrs.)		
		TED 445: Fieldwork I: Elementary Interns (15 wks. of supervised fieldwork: 450 hrs.)	TED 445: Fieldwork I: Elementary Interns (15 wks. of supervised fieldwork: 450 hrs.)	TED 495: Intern Performance Assessment Seminar: Multiple Subjects (15 wks. of supervised fieldwork: 450 hrs.)
Single Subject Exit Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">3.0 Overall rating on the thirteen TPEs with no TPE rating of 1Complete PortfolioSAST rating of 3 (Video, unit plan, student work samples, reflection)	TED 400: Introduction to Education (30 Hours Observation & Participation)	TED 407: Language Learning (Case Study of an English Learner)	TED 406: Secondary Reading and Writing in the Content Areas (Single subject 5 hrs.)	
	TED 402: Educational Psychology (10 Hours Child Observation)	TED454: Secondary Student Teaching I (half-day: 150 hrs)	TED457: Secondary Student Teaching II: (Eleven weeks of student teaching: 300 hrs)	
		TED 465: Fieldwork I: Secondary Interns (15 wks. of supervised fieldwork: 450 hrs.)	TED 465: Fieldwork II: Secondary Interns (15 wks. of supervised fieldwork: 450 hrs.)	TED 495: Intern Performance Assessment Seminar: Single Subject (15 wks. of supervised fieldwork: 450 hrs.)
Field Experiences for Educational Specialist Candidates in Special Education				
Prerequisite Phase	Preliminary Fieldwork	Directed Teaching	Induction	
		Exit Criteria: Complete Portfolio; Overall rating on competencies of standard met		
SPE 460: Introduction to Special Education (observation)	SPE 559: Field Experiences: Infant Toddler and Preschool Interventions.(Completed during the summer following first year of coursework – one week in length)	SPE 555: Directed Teaching in Early Childhood Special Education (Completed in the final semester of coursework – 15 weeks in length)	SPE 543: Special Education Pre-induction Planning Supervision (Completed in either first or second semester of internship or during Level II for non-interns) 15 weeks	
			SPE 546: Special Education Post Induction Planning Supervision (Completed in final semester of internship or during Level II for non-interns) 15 weeks	
Mild Moderate				
SPE 460 Introduction to Special Education (observation)	SPE 523: Fieldwork In Special and General Education for Interns (Completed during first semester of internship –15 weeks) OR	SPE 566: Directed Teaching of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities (Semester: 15 weeks)	SPE 543: Special Education Pre-induction Planning Supervision (Semester: 15 weeks)	
TED 407: Language Learning (Case Study of an English Learner 5 hrs.)				

Field Experiences for Educational Specialist Candidates in Special Education			
TED 403: Elementary Reading Language Arts (Case Study, 5 hours of observation of a credentialed reading teacher-Multiple Subject) OR TED 406: Secondary Reading and Writing in the Content Areas (Single subject 5 hrs.)	SPE 556: Fieldwork In Special and General Education for Non-Interns (Completed during summer following first year of coursework – 50 hours participation in general and 50 hours in special education is required.)		SPE 546: Special Education Post-Induction Planning Supervision 15 weeks
Moderate Severe			
SPE 460 Introduction to Special Education (observation)	SPE 523: Fieldwork In Special and General Education for Interns (Completed during first semester of internship – semester long-15 weeks) OR	SPE 569: Directed Teaching of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Disabilities (Semester: 15 weeks)	SPE 543: Special Education Pre-induction Planning Supervision (Semester: 15 weeks)
TED 407: Language Learning (Case Study of an English Learner)			
TED 403: Elementary Reading Language Arts (Case Study, 5 hours of observation of a credentialed reading teacher-Multiple Subject) OR TED 406: Secondary Reading and Writing in the Content Areas (Single subject 5 hrs)	SPE 556: Fieldwork In Special and General Education for Non-Interns (Completed during summer following first year of coursework – 50 hours participation in general and 50 hours in special education is required.)		SPE 546: Special Education Post-Induction Planning Supervision (Semester: 15 weeks)

Advanced Programs Field Experience Activities		
Program	Course	Examples of Field Experiences
Physical Education Administration	PER 593	Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the Physical Education Framework for California Public Schools, the California Physical Education Challenge Standards, and the National Standards for Physical Education. These content areas emphasize foundational knowledge and experiences in motor skills and knowledge.
Educational Administration	EAD 593	CCTC requires 150 hours of fieldwork experience covering 32 competencies. University Instructors, in conjunction with School site administrators, supervisor interns assuring successful demonstration of 32 competencies within 7 domains. Supervisors verify completion of fieldwork experience and University Instructors assign credit. Each of the 32 competencies is addressed through a summary of the activity, and reflective analysis of the merits of the activity along with evidence supporting the analysis. All intern students complete a fieldwork portfolio including: hourly logs, supervisor approval of 2 semester plan, and each activity including summary, evaluation, and evidence. Candidates' portfolios demonstrate knowledge of school law and ethics, leadership, management, technology and finances. Candidates demonstrate excellence in their individually designated plans and chosen domains. Supervisors' evaluations indicate that they possess good leadership skills.
School Counseling	PPS 575	Each of the competencies in School Counseling and in School Psychology requires the candidate to map out the competency to be achieved. The activities being performed must meet standard to be verified. Candidates meet once a week with their university supervisor. Candidates must hand in their activity logs showing the date of the activity and the number of hours spent on each activity. Each candidate must hand in their Supervisor candidate competency rating forms. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of counseling skills and theories as they counsel, consult, and collaborate with P-12 students, teachers, counselors and parents. They present work samples through audiotapes and professional notebooks that are evaluated by site and university supervisors. Supervisors' ratings indicate that they possess good counseling skills.

Advanced Programs Field Experience Activities		
Program	Course	Examples of Field Experiences
School Psychology	PPS 585	Each of the competencies in School Counseling and in School Psychology requires the candidate to map out the competency to be achieved. The activities being performed must meet standard to be verified. Candidates meet once a week with their university supervisor. Candidates must hand in their activity logs showing the date of the activity and the number of hours spent on each activity. Each candidate must hand in their Supervisor candidate competency rating forms. Candidates' case studies demonstrate knowledge of educational and psychological assessment theories and techniques for diverse populations. They present work samples through audiotapes and professional notebooks that are evaluated by site and university supervisors. Supervisors' ratings indicate that they possess good assessment and intervention skills.

Initial Programs

As summarized in Table 21, initial candidates have early field experiences in which they observe teaching, work with students, and reflect in journals and course discussions. For MS and SS candidates, these observations take place in classes at different grade levels or courses, either in their own school or in another low-performing school. In phase I & II candidates complete field based methods and pedagogical courses. MS student teachers have an initial (8 weeks) student teaching in phase I and a full-day (11 weeks) student teaching in phase II. SS student teachers have an initial half-day (15 weeks) student teaching in Phase I and a full-day (15 weeks) student teaching in Phase II. University interns do two semesters of supervised fieldwork and a third semester of intern performance assessment.

Table 21 provides data that indicate Special Education candidates have an early field experience in general and special education classes in phase I as well as complete field-based courses. In phase II they do directed teaching for an entire semester. Special Education university interns do early fieldwork, Pre-Induction field supervision, and a semester of directed teaching. Early childhood special education candidates have at least two in-depth field experiences, one at the beginning of the program at Children's Hospital Los Angeles for infants and toddlers and their families and one in a preschool program that includes children with disabilities. Evaluation forms are available for the clinical fieldwork, community fieldwork, and final student teaching. Each university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and master teacher evaluates the candidates assigned to them. Individualized, well-supervised, diverse field experiences in a variety of settings provide the candidate the opportunity to observe best practices.

Advanced Programs

The field experiences require candidates to gradually assume greater professional responsibilities as they progress through the programs, as indicated in Table 3.3. The Division of Teacher Education Student Teaching Handbooks (Elementary and Secondary, Ryan and SB 2042 and the Special Education Program Directed Teaching Handbook) lists activities that candidates must complete successfully. These include diagnosing students' needs, planning and teaching lessons, participating in team planning, creating teaching materials, administering and correcting assessments and curriculum based tests, attending staff meetings, and participating in parent/teacher conferences. Candidates gradually assume these responsibilities as documented in by the site-based supervisors' evaluation and the candidates' portfolios.

In TED 403, 404 and 407, MS, SS, and ES candidates complete a signature assignment with PK-12 students in their fieldwork placement. The signature assignment in 403 consists of candidates developing and implementing a language proficiency assessment and an ELD lesson plan, and a reading diagnosis with lesson plan. In TED 404, candidates develop lesson plans with an

assessment of student learning, and conduct an analysis of student work samples for writing applied in the content areas. Signature course assignments are assessed with a rubric and placed in the candidates' electronic portfolio. Rubrics are aggregated and analyzed for programmatic impacts and programmatic decision-making.

In TED 406 and 467 signature assignments require SS and ES candidates to plan and deliver instruction in public school classrooms during their supervised field experiences. Candidates develop and implement a subject matter diagnosis and lesson within their authorized credential subject, a language proficiency assessment with Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) lesson plan, and a lesson plan that incorporates reading and writing in the content areas with an analysis of student work samples. Signature course assignments are assessed with a rubric and placed in the candidates' portfolio. In completing the signature assignments, candidates demonstrate the understanding of and ability to diagnose diverse students' learning needs, especially English Learners, plan for instruction, teach, assess learning, and reflect on improving instruction.

Assessments have been developed to represent the CF. The new professional development survey and student teaching/fieldwork/directed teaching assessment instruments are related to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The latter survey connects to the standards based and performance assessed themes of the Conceptual Framework and the signature assignment. These closely align with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the Conceptual Framework.

Candidates demonstrate their technological skills by using: Excel spreadsheets to create a class profile and manage grade book, the internet or software resources to create rubrics for student assignments and to research resources for lesson design, Microsoft templates to create materials for class such as a letter or newsletter, a database to support student gathering and analysis of data, PowerPoint to deliver instruction, multimedia to deliver instruction, and create a videotapes of instruction. Interviews with student teachers, interns and advanced program candidates indicated that resources are adequate in their districts and/or university labs to use technology as an instructional tool.

The student teacher and university intern assessment instruments provide comprehensive data regarding candidates' performance in the classroom as Table 11 indicates. It is expected that a novice teacher will reach a score of 3. A score of 4 is above the expected performance. Level 4 recognizes a candidate who begins to demonstrate advanced teaching performance.

MS and SS candidates apply and are assessed on professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills during their student teaching/fieldwork experiences. Key items from the Assessment Summary of Teaching Practice in Table 22 indicate that the majority of candidates reach the required standard of 3.0.

Table 22: Mean Scores on Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Related to Candidate Performance by Supervisors on the SB 2042 ASTP, Fall 03-Spring 04

N/O=Not observed	Phase I N=92	Phase II N=188
TPE Item	Mean Score	Mean Score
TPE# 2: Monitoring Student learning During Instruction	N/O	3.66
TPE# 3: Interpretation & Use of Assessments	N/O	3.45
TPE# 4: Making Content Accessible	N/O	3.61
TPE# 5: Student Engagement	3.68	3.59
TPE# 6: Developmentally Appropriate Practice	N/O	3.49
TPE# 7: Teaching English Learners	3.60	3.58
TPE# 8: Learning About Students	3.63	3.58
TPE# 9: Instructional Planning	3.68	3.64
TPE# 10: Instructional Time	N/O	3.51
TPE# 11: Social Environment	3.67	3.63

Additionally data from surveys (see Table 14) show satisfaction among graduates and employers on items related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills that compares favorably to the system-wide data. Candidates' greatest area of dissatisfaction was their lack of preparedness to interact with family and community. This concern has been forwarded to the TED Curriculum Committee and the following actions taken: a Family Engagement Plan has been added to TED 470.

The CSU Chancellor's Office conducts a similar survey (CSU System-wide Survey) for graduates and employers statewide and provides comparative data to individual universities. These data suggest that employers and supervisors as well as the candidates themselves judge COE candidates as well prepared or very well prepared.

Additionally, University supervisors' assessments of candidates in initial programs in the field provide evidence of teacher dispositions. Assessment of CSTP Standard 6: Developing as a Professional Educator for the educational specialist and Ryan MS and SS candidates and TPE #12: Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations and TPE #13: Professional Growth for the SB 2042 MS and SS candidates measure initial candidates' dispositions. The ES and Ryan MS & SS group compiles a professional portfolio during their supervised field experiences evaluated by university supervisors. The SB 2042 group completes a summative assessment task documenting their growth as a professional with a reflective essay and a video of their practice assessed by university assessors using a scaled rubric. In addition these candidates' works are collected in an electronic portfolio. University supervisors document candidates' professional dispositions in fieldwork with the Assessment Summary of Teaching Practice.

Items related to dispositions from the Ryan MS and SS student teaching /fieldwork assessment instruments are listed in Tables 23 to 25. Student teachers do one semester of student teaching and university interns do two semesters of fieldwork. The standard is 3.0, the rating 4.0 exceeds the standard.

Table 23: Mean Ratings For Selected Items Related To Dispositions By Fieldwork Supervisors for Ryan Multiple and Single Subject Candidates

Ryan Multiple Subject Candidates Sampled Data T=Traditional (Student Teacher) A= Alternative (University Intern)	Fall 1999-2004	
	Multiple	
	T	A
Demonstrates ability to conduct parent conference.	3.61	3.65
Recognizes and accepts diverse cognitive and communication modalities.	3.64	3.73
Demonstrates ability to assume professional responsibilities.	3.70	3.63
Becomes familiar with legal aspects of education.	3.64	3.45
Ryan Single Subject Candidates Sampled Data T=Traditional (Student Teacher) A= Alternative (University Intern)	Fall 1999-2004	
	Single	
	T	A
Creates a learning atmosphere that provides equal opportunities for all learners to grow academically, socially, and emotionally.	3.60	3.62
Demonstrates ability to assume professional responsibility.	3.60	3.73
Demonstrates ability to change teaching behavior.	3.71	3.64

Items related to dispositions from the SB 2042 MS and SS student teaching/fieldwork assessment instruments are listed in Table 24. Candidates do two semesters of either student teaching or fieldwork. The standard is 3.0, the rating 4.0 exceeds the standard.

Table 24: Mean Ratings For Selected Items Related To Dispositions By Fieldwork Supervisors for SB 2042 Multiple and Single Subject Candidates

	Fall 2003-2004	
	Phase I Mean Score	Phase II Mean Score
Analyzes own personal values and biases to provide equal opportunities.	N/A	3.58
Understands professional and legal responsibilities under state and federal law.	N/A	3.58
Evaluates teaching using feedback and reflection to increase subject matter and teaching effectiveness.	N/A	3.63

Items related to dispositions from the Educational Specialist/Special Education directed teaching assessment instruments are listed in Table 25.

Table 25: Composite Mean Ratings For Selected Items Related To Dispositions By Fieldwork Supervisors for Educational Specialists/Special Education Candidates

	Fall 2002-Spring 2004	
	SPE 523	SPE 569
Behavior Management	4.2	4.75
Classroom Management	3.45	4.65
Paraeducators	3.35	4.65
Professional Development	4.25	4.7

The program exit survey conducted at the candidates' completion of the program, and the follow-up graduate/employer survey, conducted after candidates have been teaching for at least one year and not more than two years provide additional evidence that candidates demonstrate professional dispositions.

In the Teacher Education Exit Surveys summarized in Table 26, initial candidates perceive themselves as being able to demonstrate professional dispositions.

**Table 26: Selected Items from Teacher Education Data from Candidate Exit Surveys
Aggregate, 2000-2004**

Rating (%) of Teacher Preparation (CSTP Domains)	Fall 2000-Fall 2002	Spring 2003-Spring 2004
The program prepared me to:	% agreement	% effectiveness
1. Use a variety of instructional strategies and resources to respond to students' diverse needs.	73	75
3. Establish an environment that promotes fairness, respect, and group responsibility.	74	80
7. Draw on and value students' backgrounds, interests, prior knowledge, and developmental learning needs.	72	77
12. Communicate with students, families, and other audiences about student progress.	55	60
13. Reflect on teaching practices and develop strategies for professional growth.	68	73
14. Work with colleagues to improve professional practice.	61	66

Results from the graduate and employer surveys (see Table 16) demonstrate satisfaction among graduates and employers on items related to dispositions. Employers expressed a greater degree of satisfaction on the selected items than did candidates. Candidates' greatest area of dissatisfaction was their lack of preparedness to interact with family and community.

Advanced Programs

Advanced candidates' dispositions are assessed through multiple processes such as admission interviews, faculty/advisor relationships, university and/or school site supervisors' field experience assessments, and reflections in professional notebooks and portfolios. The California Code of Educational Regulations, the California Standards for Public School Administrators, ISLLC, CACREP, CACREP, ISTE and NASP inform the dispositions of advanced candidates.

Results from the candidate exit surveys (see Table 17) show differing levels of satisfaction among graduates on items related to dispositions.

Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills and dispositions to help all students learn

Entry and exit criteria for clinical practice for teachers and other school personnel have been summarized in Table 4. Tables 27 and 28 summarize the number of candidates eligible for clinical practice and those who complete.

Table 27: Candidates Admitted To Student Teaching/Directed Teaching/ Supervised Fieldwork –Initial Programs, 2000-2004

Program	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
Multiple Subject	642	618	561	744	1081*
Single Subject	206	204	206	236	564*
Early Childhood Special Education	19	31	27	25	19
Mild/Moderate Special Education	61	51	103	147	178
Moderate/Severe Special Education	29	19	19	16	32
Adult Education	38	65	82	62	32

*Includes new SB2042 candidates.

Table 28: Candidate Completion Rate (%) for Student Teaching/Directed Teaching/Supervised Fieldwork

Program	1999-2000		2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003		2003-2004	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Multiple Subject	614	95.4	584	94.49	540	96.25	736	98.92	1047	96.85
Single Subject	173	83.98	173	84.80	202	98.05	230	97.45	506	89.71
Early Childhood Special Education	8	100	24	77.42	27	100	25	100	19	100
Mild/Moderate Special Education	59	96.72	49	96.08	93	90.29	143	97.28	161	96.07
Moderate/Severe Special Education	26	89.66	18	94.74	17	89.47	15	93.75	32	100
Adult Education	38	100	65	100	82	100	62	100	32	100

Supervisors and cooperating teachers provide ongoing feedback to candidates regarding their performance on the TPE's Completion of student teaching/fieldwork/directed teaching requires that candidates demonstrate acceptable knowledge, skills and dispositions. The assessment instruments include cooperating teacher assessments, or competencies during pre- and post-observation conferences. Candidates use the feedback to practice and refine their skills. Surveys about field experiences indicate that candidates perform well in field placements and offer suggestions of way to enhance their performance.

Supervisors and assessors use the CSTP standards measured by the student teaching assessment instruments to guide their formative assessment of candidates' performance using a variety of evidence sources such as observation notes, curriculum plans, and student work samples. A carefully conceived system of formative and summative assessment is embedded throughout the program to provide candidates with timely, accurate, and complete feedback regarding their pedagogical assignments and performance in the field. The programs are using this data to identify strengths and weaknesses in the program.

National content standards were considered when the CDE developed CA content standards and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, are based on national professional standards. All are congruent with the CSUDH Student Learning Outcomes. The coursework, fieldwork and field experience activities are tied to the CF the CSTP, and the CA Content Standards. Table 29 documents the assessment of knowledge, skills and dispositions demonstrated in the initial programs during Transition Point Three.

Table 29: Completion of Field Experience Activity

Category of Evidence	Data	Source
Candidate Performance	Teaching Assessment Instrument	Fieldwork Supervisor Observation Instrument
Candidate content and professional knowledge	Portfolio, signature assignments	Fieldwork Supervisor Rubric, Course Instructor
Candidate dispositions	Teaching Assessment Instrument	Fieldwork Supervisor Observation Instrument
Diversity Experience	Diversity of field experience activity	Program Coordinator: Signed Observation Form, Reflective essay
Impact on student learning	Assessment forms, portfolio, reflective essays	Fieldwork Supervisor or Faculty

All initial candidates are required to have experiences working with diverse populations. They observe in both general and special education classes in early fieldwork and MS and SS candidates have to observe and participate in two settings during early fieldwork. In student

teaching I, MS candidates work in a K-3 settings and SS candidates with middle school English Learners. In student teaching II, MS candidates work in grades 4 to 6 and SS candidates work in public high schools in the diverse Los Angeles School District. All initial candidates use the internet to research lessons, create rubrics, use spreadsheets to manage classroom data, and use software to communicate and present information.

All advanced candidates work in school settings with diverse populations. In the educational administration program, candidates map their plan for meeting the competencies at the outset of the experience with their site supervisor (see Table 30).

Table 30: Completion of Field Experience Activity

Category of Evidence	Data	Source
Candidate Performance	Program Assessment	Program Coordinator or Faculty (
Candidate content and professional knowledge	Earn at least a B in each course with a minimum GPA of 3.0	Transcript (ER doc #S3E3.10)
Candidate dispositions	Course requirements or field assessment	Program Coordinator (and Site supervisor
Diversity Experience	Diversity of field experience activity	Fieldwork Supervisor or Faculty
Impact on student learning or environment for student learning	Program requirement: assessment forms, notebooks, competency lists, reflections	Fieldwork Supervisor or Faculty

Advanced candidates use the internet to research site-based information, use spreadsheets and databases to manage classroom, use software to communicate and present information, use of research (student achievement) and data collection in school planning and management .

All initial candidates are required to have experiences working with diverse populations. Education Specialists observe in both general and special education classes in early fieldwork and MS and SS candidates have to observe and participate in two settings during early fieldwork. In student teaching I, MS candidates work in a K-3 settings and SS candidates with middle school English Learners. In student teaching II, MS candidates work in grades 4-6 and SS candidates work in public high schools in the diverse Los Angeles School District. All initial candidates use the internet to research lessons, create rubrics, use spreadsheets to manage classroom data, and use software to communicate and present information.

All advanced candidates work in school settings with diverse populations. In the educational administration program, candidates map their plan for meeting the competencies at the outset of the experience with their site supervisor.

Assignments designed to support candidate learning are described in The Division of Teacher Education Student Teaching Handbooks (Elementary and Secondary, Ryan and SB 2042) and the Special Education Program Directed Teaching Handbook lists activities that candidates must successfully complete. These include diagnosing students' needs, planning and teaching lessons, participating in team planning, creating teaching materials, administering and correcting assessments and curriculum based tests, attend staff meetings, participate in parent/teacher conferences. Candidates gradually assume these responsibilities as documented in by the site-based supervisors' evaluation and the candidates' portfolios.

In TED 403, 404 and 407, MS, SS, and ES candidates complete a signature assignment with PK-12 students in their fieldwork placement. The signature assignment in 403 consists of candidates developing and implementing a language proficiency assessment and an ELD lesson plan, and a

reading diagnosis with lesson plan. In TED 404, candidates develop lesson plan with an assessment of student learning, and conduct an analysis of student work samples for writing applied in the content areas. Signature course assignments are assessed with a rubric and placed in the candidates' electronic portfolio. Rubrics are aggregated and analyzed for programmatic impacts and programmatic decision-making.

Time for reflection and feedback is incorporated into the field experiences and clinical practices through the assignment of reflective essays, reflective conversations, and feedback during the pre-observation observation and post-observation conferences with MS, SS and ES candidates.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Document review, interviews with candidates, clinical and COE faculty, master teachers, employers, and graduates indicate that the College of Education in collaboration with its public school partners provides field experience and clinical practice that allow candidates to apply and reflect on their content, professional and pedagogical knowledge and dispositions in a variety of settings with students and adults. Both field experiences and clinical practice reflect the unit's conceptual framework and help candidates continue to develop the content, pedagogical knowledge, skills, dispositions delineated in standards. Clinical practice allows candidates to use information technology to support teaching and learning and is sufficiently extensive and intensive for candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the professional roles for which they are preparing. Candidates develop and demonstrate proficiencies that support learning by all students as shown in their work with exceptionalities and diverse, ethnic, racial, gender, and socioeconomic groups in classrooms and schools. Their experiences prepare them well for success, particularly in an urban education environment.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings

The College of Education's (COE) commitment to diversity is described in its CF and clarified in its goals and objectives to recruit, retain and prepare a diverse student body to the highest of standards; to prepare educational professionals for diverse urban public schools; to recruit, support and retain a diverse faculty; and to create programs that serve the educational needs of diverse candidates.

Using identified CF goals and objectives, the COE Diversity Committee developed the COE Diversity Plan to provide a focus in their continued endeavors to maintain and improve their commitments to diversity and serve as a barometer to measure the unit's progress in reaching its goals and objectives in this arena. As part of the process of updating the most recent plan, the committee reviewed the 1999 plan and then collected data from the faculty and staff by means of a survey developed from the knowledge base of the National Association of Multicultural Education (NAME) and the input of the COE Council and COE Evaluation Committee.

The first part of the survey asked faculty to respond to issues concerning recruitment and retention, faculty knowledge and comfort in teaching diversity and COE professional support. These results are summarized in Table 31. As perceived by faculty, their greatest strengths are in the areas of the recruitment and retention of diverse candidates, the faculty knowledge about diversity and comfort teaching about diversity. Their areas in most need of further development are recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and the unit's support of professional development in these areas. The university has developed a new faculty support plan that includes release time, a formalized mentoring program, and other supports from the Center for Teaching and Learning. The Provost and Vice Provost also articulated their support at the university level for support in these areas.

The goal of the plan is to develop capacity of the unit with ethnic, racial, gender, language, exceptionalities, religious groups and exceptional populations. Six stated objectives of the plan include:

1. Monitor and refine the recruitment and retention process;
2. Maintain strategies to recruit and retain diverse faculty;
3. Design, implement and evaluate curriculum and experiences;
4. Monitor and improve experiences working with diverse faculty;
5. Monitor and improve experiences working with diverse candidates; and
6. Monitor and improve experiences working with diverse students in PK-12 schools.

Table 31: CSUDH Diversity Faculty Survey Spring 2004 (N=25)

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following:		SA	A	D	SD	DK	O
In the last several years there have been good-faith efforts to recruit diverse faculty.	F	8	6	2	1	6	2
	%	32	24	8	4	24	8
	C%	32	56	64	68	92	100
In the last several years there have been good-faith efforts to retain diverse faculty.	F	4	8	4	3	4	2
	%	16	32	16	12	16	8
	C%	16	48	64	76	92	100
In the last several years there have been good-faith efforts to Recruit diverse candidates.	F	10	7	1	1	4	2
	%	40	28	4	4	16	8
	C%	40	68	72	76	92	100
In the last several years there have been good-faith efforts to retain diverse candidates.	F	8	7	2	2	4	2
	%	32	28	8	8	16	8
	C%	32	60	68	76	92	100
I feel knowledgeable about teaching concepts related to diversity.	F	12	10	1	0	1	1
	%	48	40	4	0	4	4
	C%	48	88	92	92	96	100
I feel comfortable about teaching concepts related to diversity.	F	17	6	1	0	0	1
	%	68	24	4	0	0	4
	C%	68	92	96	96	96	100
The COE provides adequate opportunities to learn about concepts and issues of diversity through professional development workshops and other support programs.	F	3	9	8	3	1	1
	%	12	36	32	12	4	4
	C%	12	48	80	92	96	100
Mean Totals	F	9	8	3	1	3	1
	%	35	32	11	6	11	4
	C%	35	66	77	82	94	100
Legend F=Frequency %=Percentage C%=Cumulative Percentage * Note: Cumulative % in the Gray highlighted boxes represent the Top 2 categories of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree".							
		SA=Strongly Agree		SD=Strongly Disagree			
		A=Agree		DK=Don't Know			
		D=Disagree		O=Omit			

Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

In support of reaching unit goals and objectives and in response to evaluation data, the following processes have been put in place in the university and the COE: (a) advertise faculty positions nationally and in diverse community and professional publications; (b) utilize the California State University Forgivable Loans, encourage faculty to use the Center for Teaching and Learning resources, and formalize the mentoring system; (c) review knowledge base, curriculum, syllabi and candidate assessments to ensure the coherence of diversity issues across programs; (d) facilitate and monitor candidates' interactions with faculty through self reflection and assessments and improvement of advising processes; (e) support further faculty professional development and research; (f) continue and expand remediation and academic support for candidates, continue scholarship development; and (g) review reflections from field and clinical experiences and continue to develop the Professional Development School model.

Candidates at both the initial and advanced levels are expected to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity included in the Conceptual Framework. As reflected in their assessment system, candidates are expected to demonstrate:

- **knowledge** to develop an understanding of the historical and cultural traditions of major cultural and ethnic groups in California, to identify pedagogical and school practices that may stem from racial, cultural, ethnic, and gender biases that hinder academic achievement and challenge the well-being of all students, to demonstrate knowledge of key historical trends in education, including the education of special populations of learners, to understand the impact of sociological and cultural influences on the process of education for children, including learners with special needs, teachers and policy makers, to know and understand the impact of local, state, and federal politics and laws on the process of education, especially as related to special education and student placement.
- **skills** to utilize appropriate methods and materials to practice and promote multicultural education, to identify, analyze, and minimize personal and institutional bias with regard to race, poverty, creed, nationality, gender, and sexual orientation; develop effective instructional strategies for use with the major cultural and ethnic groups in California; work successfully with diverse students in urban environments, develop planning and instructional skills for- promoting academic achievement and educational equity for all students in the classroom, develop appropriate cross-cultural communication skills to interact with children and adults from diverse cultural, linguistic, racial, ethnic, socio-economic backgrounds; develop responsive pedagogy that will both accommodate and challenge all students; and develop skills and strategies for positive familial engagement.
- **dispositions** to realize their own personal and professional growth through reflection and self-evaluation, to demonstrate sensitivity toward and effectiveness with, people from diverse backgrounds, develop an understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity and its applications to teaching multicultural populations, examine own personal beliefs towards people of different cultural, linguistic, racial, ethnic, socio-economic and gender backgrounds, understand the impact of local, state, and federal politics and laws on the process of education, especially as related to special education and student placement, understand the effects of family involvement on student achievement.

Data that support the assessment of these knowledges, skills, and dispositions are presented in the Introduction, Conceptual Framework, Standard 1, and Standard 3 of this report.

Initial Programs

During their professional preparation, candidates are prepared to work in diverse settings with diverse PK-12 students. This ranges from coursework and early field experiences to student teaching/fieldwork/directed teaching.

All initial program courses embed elements of diversity indicative of the COE's commitment to diversity, the characteristics of the student body, and nature of the service area. Review of syllabi, interviews with faculty and candidates, and classroom observation confirmed that methods classes include differentiated instruction and appropriate assessment practices for English Learners and students with special needs. Candidates' ability and predispositions toward working with diverse learners are assessed in coursework through examinations, projects, presentations, and in fieldwork through reflection, teaching assessment instruments, and portfolio review. Table 32 summarizes how diversity is implemented in the initial programs.

Table 32: Initial Program Courses with a Diversity Emphasis

Course	Diversity Emphasis	Assessment
Multiple and Single Subject Program		
TED 400 Introduction to Education 1,2	Candidates observe classroom routines, instructional strategies, and school policies as teachers in urban, multicultural public schools implement them.	Pre-FAST (Prerequisite Formative Assessment Task)
TED 402 Educational Psychology 1,2,3	Candidates gain an understanding of human development, motivation, and learning and exceptionalities and are introduced to differentiated instruction.	Signature Assignment; Pre-FAST
TED 411: Classroom Management 1,2,3	Candidates examine student behavior and classroom management issues to assure that personal bias or beliefs do not disadvantage individuals or groups of students in class discussions and activities, as well as creating an equitable classroom community.	Signature Assignment; Pre-FAST
TED 415: Multicultural Education 1,2,3	Candidates develop knowledge and skills to identify, analyze, and minimize personal and institutional bias with regard to race, poverty, immigrants, gender, and sexual orientation and discover cultural traditions and community values in the public school setting and how to incorporate these aspects into their planning.	Signature Assignment; Pre-FAST
TED 470: Critical Perspectives in Education 1,2,3	Candidates examine and refine their understanding of bias and diversity in a number of class discussions and reflective writings, demonstrate their ability to conceptualize their own educational beliefs and opinions (Educational Philosophy Assignment) and to conceptualize and develop an explicit plan to reform the classroom and school in which they are teaching (School Reform Plan).	Educational Philosophy; School Reform Plan
TED 407: Language Learning 1,2,3	Candidates develop knowledge of language acquisition and cognition, language proficiency assessment, language learning pedagogy and skills to support English learners.	Signature Assignment; Formative Assessment Task # 1 (FAST)
TED 434: Elementary Student Teaching I or TED 445: Elementary Intern Fieldwork I 1,2,3	Candidates conduct a reading diagnosis, create a reading lesson plan with accommodations for individual learners, implement the plan using instructional strategies to support all learners, and reflect on student learning. Candidates conduct a language proficiency assessment, create an English Language Development lesson plan, implement the plan, and reflect on student learning.	Assessment Summary of Teaching Performance (ASTP); FAST # 1
TED 437: Elementary Student Teaching II or TED 445: Elementary Intern Fieldwork II 1,2,3	Candidates diagnose students' knowledge and skills in mathematics, create a unit plan, teach a related lesson to a class, and assess and reflect on student learning. Candidates analyze work samples in a content area to determine reading comprehension and writing needs, plan, and teach the lesson that addresses these needs. Candidates videotape lesson from integrated unit plan and reflect on student learning.	Assessment Summary of Teaching Performance (ASTP); FAST # 2
TED 454: Secondary Student Teaching I or TED 465: Secondary Intern Fieldwork I 1,2,3	Candidates conduct a diagnosis of students' knowledge and skills in the authorized credential subject, create a lesson plan with accommodations for individual learners, implement the plan using instructional strategies to support all learners, and reflect on student learning. Candidates conduct a language proficiency assessment, create a Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) lesson plan, implement the plan, and reflect on student learning.	Assessment Summary of Teaching Performance (ASTP); FAST # 1
TED 437: Secondary Student Teaching II or TED 465: Secondary Intern Fieldwork II 1,2,3	Candidates diagnose students' knowledge and skills in the unit topic from the authorized credential subject, create a unit plan, teach a related lesson, and assess and reflect on student learning. Candidates analyze work sample in the authorized credential subject area to determine reading comprehension and writing needs, plan and teach the lesson that addresses these needs. Candidates videotape lesson from unit plan and reflect on student learning.	Assessment Summary of Teaching Performance (ASTP); FAST # 2
Educational Specialist Program		
SPE 460: Introduction to Special Education 1,2	Candidates observe a school, classroom or program that provides transition services to individuals with disabilities. Specific aspects considered are the demographics of the eligible population, service delivery model, funding source, services provided and accessibility. Each of these program attributes is evaluated in the context of the diverse population of the geographic area the program serves. In this seminar candidates also review issues of disproportionate representation of students who are culturally and linguistically diverse in the special education population and how to use appropriate referral interventions to reduce this challenge.	Examination, case study, reflective essay.
SPE 545: Multicultural Strategies for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners 1,2,3	Candidates examine critical issues of diversity. They explore and reflect on the social construction of race, ethnicity, culture and disability. In addition, they deconstruct their own personal beliefs and assumptions about diversity, and reflect on how these beliefs inform their curriculum and pedagogy.	Differentiated lesson plan

Course	Diversity Emphasis	Assessment
SPE 558 Managing Learning Environments in Special and General Education 1,2,3	Candidates examine classroom management strategies to ensure that students' behaviors are evaluated within the context of both home and school culture. They learn that culturally appropriate behaviors often differ and that their expectations and practices must be responsive to diverse cultural norms.	Examinations, Functional Behavior Analysis Case Study
SPE 560 Language/Speech Development, Disabilities, and Alternative Communication Systems 1,2	Candidates explore how culture may influence a family's acceptance of a child with a disability. They examine different responses to diagnoses, medical procedures, and augmentative and alternative communication devices. The influence accent and dialect may have on the diagnosis of a language or speech disorder is addressed as is the relevance of assessment in the students' home language.	Examinations, Analysis if Language Samples
SPE 561 Typical and Atypical Development, and Assessment Issues in Special and General Education 1,2,3	Candidates explore how culture may influence a family's acceptance of a child with a disability. They examine different responses to evaluation, diagnosis, medical procedures, and school placement. The need for non-biased assessment is discussed as well.	Research Paper, examinations, Site visitation reflection
SPE 555: Directed Teaching in Early Childhood Special Education 1,2,3	Candidates diagnose students' present level of performance, create an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and or IEP, including annual goals and short-term objectives being academic and/or socio-emotional teach a related lesson, and assess and reflect on student learning. Candidates support family involvement in planning process and collaborate with support providers including medical personnel and physical therapists.	Professional Portfolio, teaching assessment instrument, performance reflection
SPE 566: Directed Teaching of Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities 1,2,3	Candidates diagnose students' present level of performance create an Individual Transition Plan (ITP) and or IEP, including annual goals and short-term objectives being academic and/or socio-emotional; teach a related lessons; and assess and reflect on student learning. Candidates support family involvement in the planning process and collaborate with support providers including occupational therapists, general education teachers, and paraprofessionals.	Professional Portfolio, teaching assessment instrument, performance reflection
SPE 569: Directed Teaching of Individuals with Mild/ Moderate Disabilities 1,2,3	Candidates diagnose students' present level of performance create an Individual Transition Plan (ITP) and or IEP, including annual goals and short-term objectives being academic and/or socio-emotional; teach related lessons; and assess and reflect on student learning. Candidates support family involvement in the planning process and collaborate with support providers including community agencies, general education teachers, and paraprofessionals.	Professional Portfolio, teaching assessment instrument, performance reflection

1= courses/experiences that are required

2= courses/experiences that enable candidates to develop awareness of importance of diversity in teaching and learning

3= courses/experiences that enable candidates to develop KSD to adapt instruction and services to diverse populations.

The Multiple Subject (MS/elementary) and Single Subject (SS/secondary) program designs includes courses that encourage study and discussion of the historical and cultural traditions of the major cultural and ethnic groups in California and in the geographic area that candidates are or will be teaching. Interviews with candidates, review of syllabi and faculty interviews determined that candidates are provided with techniques that assist them in observing the ways teachers respond to cultural and linguistic diversity in their classrooms. It was confirmed through interviews with candidates, review of syllabi, and faculty interviews that candidates are taught how to identify cultural traditions and community values in the public school setting and how to incorporate these aspects into their planning. As importantly, candidates critically examine the purpose and function of education and the role and responsibilities of teachers in the classrooms with diverse student populations. Assessments of candidates' prerequisite reflective essay provide evidence of meeting these standards.

In field experiences, candidates apply what they have learned in courses through a combination of classroom observation and participation activities. Interviews with candidates and their school-based supervisors, indicate candidates use a prompted journal format to record their observations and reflections in urban, multicultural and multilingual classrooms. As a prominent component of this experience, they are charged with researching the historical context of the school, discovering the demographics, traditions, and values of the school community, and

meeting school staff and faculty members to gain a comprehensive understanding of the school culture. By creating and implementing lesson plans that meet the needs of all students, candidates demonstrate their ability to support student learning during fieldwork. Team review of candidates' reflective essays (FAST #1 and #2) provide evidence of these assessments.

The Special Education Program is designed so that curriculum, pedagogy and assessment are informed by the knowledge, skills and dispositions candidates need as they work with students who are predominantly culturally and linguistically diverse. Interviews with candidates, faculty and employers, as well as review of syllabi, reveal that coursework leads candidates to develop an appreciation and understanding of the cultural and ethnic diversity of their school community. The review of these data sources consistently indicated that candidates are taught to recognize the value of individual differences, to promote educational equity and social justice, and to utilize appropriate methods and materials for multicultural education.

Review of fieldwork reflection logs shows that in early field experiences candidates reflect on and apply what they have learned in seminar courses through classroom observation and participation. This finding was validated through interviews with candidates, faculty and employers. Faculty analysis of these logs and survey data indicate: Fieldwork enables candidates to situate the theories they are learning in their seminars, allows candidates to learn through collaboration with other professionals in the field, and to implement instructional strategies they have learned for modifying curriculum for linguistically diverse and exceptional learners.

Interviews with candidates and faculty, and review of candidates' Induction Plans, revealed that candidates research the socio-cultural and historical context of their school and report on the demographics and daily practices of the school community. There is clear evidence that faculty analysis of candidates' Induction Plans show the attainment of these standards. Professional development goals in the induction plans indicate candidates' desire to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students, their families, and their support systems. Review of post-induction interviews indicates that the time spent learning about the school and community culture result in effective modifications and accommodations needed in these diverse classrooms.

Advanced Programs

During their professional preparation, advanced candidates are prepared to work in diverse settings with diverse PK-12 students in coursework, and field and clinical settings. Candidates are assessed in coursework through examinations, projects, and presentations and in fieldwork through reflection, practica, fieldwork assessments, and portfolio review. Course syllabi provide the specifics. Table 33 lists Advanced Program Courses with a Diversity Emphasis.

The principal goal of the PPS (Pupil Personnel Services) programs is to provide candidates with opportunities to assess, evaluate, and collaborate with PK-12 multicultural, urban populations served by California schools. Candidates are prepared to provide PPS services to schools and programs designed to assess and address the educational needs of all students in a variety of community contexts. Issues related to a diverse and pluralistic society are addressed throughout the PPS program knowledge base. Course syllabi reflect a knowledge base concerning diversity. Instruction, field experience, and clinical practice relate to issues of diversity. Candidates are assessed by the unit for their ability to work in diverse settings. Review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty and candidates, reveals that PPS course pedagogy fosters discourse concerning diversity using methods such as cooperative learning, group projects, and other interactive formats.

Table 33: Advanced Program Courses with a Diversity Emphasis

Program	Advanced Program Courses
Pupil Personnel Services	PPS 512: Consultation and Collaboration in Multicultural Settings PPS 505: Human Diversity PPS 508: Multicultural and Legal Issues in Counseling and School Psychology
M.A. in Ed., all options Required Core Course	GED 503: Socio-cultural Issues in Education, related objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the relationship between philosophy, culture and the school process. • Analyze influence of culture on the individual and education. • Describe influence of socio-cultural issues on the American educational system. • Define difference between the constructs of assimilation and acculturation. • Analyze the influence of socio-economic status on educational attainment and social mobility. • Analyze the relationship between gender and educational equity. • Present current research on socio-cultural issues in education.
Technology Based Education	TBE 540, TBE 550, TBE 560, and TBE 570: Class projects emphasizing technology adaptation for language difference and special needs, as well as cultural considerations.
Multicultural	MUL 520: The Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages MUL 521: Seminar of Mexican American and Hispanic Education MUL 522: Teaching Reading and Literacy in Spanish MUL 525: Bilingual-Multicultural Teaching Methods
Teaching Curriculum	CUR 519: Advanced Study in Curriculum Research and Instructional Practice
Educational Administration	MUL 520: The Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages and SPE 524: Advanced Leadership Management and Curriculum Modifications for Diverse Learners with Disabilities are required courses.

As with other programs, the PPS programs address the issues pertaining to diversity and the need for advocacy throughout candidates' coursework. Review of syllabi and interviews with faculty, staff, and employers shows that candidates regularly examine the issue of barriers to learning and to life, and the need for advocates who will support, champion and protect those less advantaged. Each course develops candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions appropriate to the diversity in their schools and critically examining marginalized populations within traditional society and reaffirms the deep appreciation for diversity detailed in the Conceptual Framework.

Advocacy is taught as a collaborative approach to implementing a pupil support team, as determined through review of syllabi and interviews with candidates, faculty and employers. Candidates demonstrate advocacy before entering fieldwork. Candidates in fieldwork are required to practice in public school settings where the majority of the population of pupils is of different ethnicities than the Fieldworker. Review of candidates' professional notebooks and field and university supervisors' assessments show that the diversity standards have been met.

The Education Administration Program is designed to study effective ways to structure learning opportunities for the diverse populations served by California schools. Candidates are prepared to administer schools and implement programs designed to assess and address the educational needs of all students in a variety of community contexts. The program develops awareness of the impact of instructional practices and administrative decisions on students of different genders, races, ability levels, language or cultural backgrounds, religious affiliations, ethnic groups, health status, and sexual orientation. The program emphasizes the responsibility of schools to communicate school information to families whose primary language is not English.

Candidates are assessed through course case studies, presentations, research papers, class discussions, reflective journals, the exit portfolio and the comprehensive examination. These assessments provide evidence that candidates understand the impact of diversity on student achievement, personnel, school management, school discipline, and community relations; can successfully work with and be leaders of diverse groups in multicultural settings; and

demonstrate respectful and effective values toward all personnel, students, parents and communities.

The primary mission of the Multicultural Program is to train candidates to work effectively and knowledgeably with students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Interviews with graduates and candidates finds that candidates are able to design instruction for limited English proficient students, demonstrate mastery of and be able to apply theories and philosophies related to teaching and learning in diverse environments, and teach using bilingual and/or bi-dialectical methodologies.

Experiences working with diverse faculty

Initial and Advanced Programs

The university and unit have committed to the recruiting and retaining of a diverse faculty and staff that reflect the diversity of their communities and schools. In fall 2003, 33% of the university full-time faculty represented diverse groups as depicted in Tables 34 and 35.

Table 34: CSUDH Faculty Demographics, Fall 2003

Rank	Male		Female		American Indian/ Alaskan Native		Asian		Hispanic		African American		White		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professor	80	29	44	16	0	0	7	6	11	9	8	6	97	78	1	1
Associate Professor	18	7	19	7	2	5	4	11	3	8	2	5	26	70	0	0
Assistant Professor	31	11	32	12	0	0	14	22	3	5	9	14	34	54	3	5
Lecturer	17	6	31	11	1	2	6	13	4	8	5	10	31	65	1	2
Totals	146		126		3		31		21		24		188		5	

Table 35: COE Faculty Demographics, Fall 2003

Department	Male		Female		American Indian/ Alaskan Native		Asian		Hispanic		African American		White		Other	
% per department	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
GED	11	42	15	57	0	0	3	12	2	8	3	12	18	69	0	0
PER	4	53	3.5*	46	0	0	2	27	0	0	0	0	5.5	73	0	0
TED	14	41	19	55	0	0	4	12	4	12	3	9	22	67	0	0
Totals	29		37.5		0		9		6		6		45.5		0	

In the CSUDH Strategic Plan, the university declares a commitment to recruit diverse faculty. Vacancy announcements are approved by the affirmative action officer before public dissemination. Positions are advertised in professional journals and organizational materials likely to serve underrepresented populations. The unit affirms this commitment in Goal Two of its Strategic Plan. The university as well as the unit has been involved in a variety of good faith faculty recruitment and retention efforts:

- Open faculty positions are advertised in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and national professional organizations and journals likely to serve underrepresented populations;

- Departments advertise in discipline-specific job listings;
- Department faculty members recruit candidates at professional conferences; and
- Unit faculty members attend Holmes Scholars receptions to recruit promising scholars from diverse cultural groups.

Good faith efforts to recruit diverse faculty are documented in Table 36.

Table 36: College of Education Demographic Data in Percentages for Faculty Recruitment 2003-2004

Year	Male	Female	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Pacific Islander	Hispanic	African American	White	Other
1999-00	5	3	0	2	0	0	2	4	0
2000-01	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2001-02	2	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	0
2002-03	2	8	0	2	0	3	1	4	0
2003-04	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
2004-05	2	4	0	0	0	4	1	1	0
Totals	14	19	0	5	0	7	5	16	0
Percentages	42%	58%	0%	15%	0%	21%	15%	48%	0%

The university and the COE use a number of techniques to strengthen the retention of diverse faculty:

- The mentoring process has been formalized in both the COE and the university;
- The university releases new faculty from 3 units of workload;
- The Office of Academic Affairs Personnel provides an orientation to new faculty;
- A program internal to the university, Research Scholarship and Creative Activities Award Program (RSCAAP), offers faculty grants to travel to academic conferences and research grants of up to \$5000; and
- The Center for Teaching and Learning provides professional development for faculty in many areas including technology, assessments and instruction.

The unit successfully hires a diverse part-time faculty (see Table 37). In 2003-2004 over 50% of the 137 part-time faculty were composed of individuals from diverse cultures. In 2003-2004 there were 128 part-time supervisors in the unit of which almost 70% represents diverse populations.

Candidates' experiences are enriched by the faculty's research and development work related to diversity and global education. Faculty research interests related to diversity include the study of preschool Latino literacy, sheltered instruction, gifted and talented minority students, bilingual education, multicultural education, assessment of diverse students, African-American standard English proficiency, full inclusion, equity in mathematics education and cooperative learning. Interview with the Diversity Support Group and review of faculty vitae reveal that faculty participate in many diversity activities including:

- Research and grants for exceptionalities;
- Membership in Japan-United States Teacher Education Consortium;
- Involvement in Global and International Student Teaching;
- FIPSE for Immigrant Professionals;
- FIPSE: Collaboration to Credential all Teachers;
- Academic Literacy Initiative; and
- Retention Study of University Interns.

**Table 37: College of Education Part-time Faculty and & Demographic Data in Percentages
03-04**

Department	Male		Female		American Indian/ Alaskan Native		Asian		Pacific Islander		Hispanic		African American		White		Multiple/No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Part time Instructors(N=137)	49	35	88	64	1	.8	6	4.3	1	.7	36	26	31	23	54	39	6	4.3
Supervisors (N=128)	36	28	92	72	1	.8	7	6	1	.8	39	31	40	31	40	31	0	0
Cooperating Teachers (N=438)	183	42	254	58	0	0	35	8	1	.2	131	30	96	22	166	38	8	2
Totals	268		434		2		48		3		206		238		260		14	

In addition to university faculty, candidates work with professionals from local schools who represent diverse backgrounds. Interviews with employers, faculty, candidates and visits to local schools provided ample evidence of deep collaborative arrangements. Faculty involvement with local schools serves to enrich the experiences of their candidates and support them in learning to address the diverse needs of PK-12 students. For example, in 2003-04, in Los Angeles County, 43% of teachers, 44% of administrative staff, 40% of pupil services and 76% of classified staff represent diverse populations.

Experiences working with diverse candidates

CSU Dominguez Hills is the second most diverse campus west of the Mississippi according to *The US News and World Report (2004)* rankings. The university student population is 35.5% Hispanic; 22.7% White; 30.9 % African American, and 10.3 % Asian and .6% American Indian. Goal Three of the COE Strategic Plan is to recruit, prepare and retain candidates who reflect the diversity of the service area. As shown in Tables 38 and 39, candidates reflect the local schools where they are placed and eventually serve as educators. At the initial level, the COE leads the state in the preparation of African-American teachers and is one of the top three universities in credentialing Hispanic teachers. Five-year trend data support this as a stable characteristic of the COE.

The data in these tables indicate that candidates have many opportunities to interact with peers of diverse backgrounds. The university and unit facilitate the delivery of these opportunities by sponsoring these organizations :

- M.E.Ch.A, Nuestro Futuro, Espiritu de Nuestro Futuro;
- Pan Afrikan Student Union, Black Student Union;
- [ASIA @ CSUDH](#), Pacific Islander Club, CSUDH Japanese Student Association;
- Vietnamese Student Association;
- Chinese Student Association;
- Pilipino Educational and Cultural Experience;
- Catholic Newman Club;
- Muslim Student Association at CSUDH;
- Toros Christian Fellowship;
- Women's Center;
- The Multicultural Center;
- Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Student Association;
- Future Teachers Club/Student California Teachers Association;

- Technology interactions: Candidates work with each other in diverse groups doing cooperative assignments in Blackboard and TeachScape; and
- Exchange programs with other institutions: Candidate participation in the Global Student Teaching Program and International Education Programs.

Table 38: Initial Programs Demographic Data in Percentages for 2003-2004 by Exit Surveys

Programs	Male	Female	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Pacific Islander	Hispanic	African American	White	Other/ Multiple
Liberal Studies Program	5	95	0	3	2	52	14	14	8
Special Education	19	75	0	13	0	19	13	37	12
TED	29	62	1	6	1	41	17	21	5

*Percentages do not add up to 100% due to respondents declining to respond.

Table 39: Advanced Programs Demographic Data in Percentages for 2003-2004 by Exit Surveys

Program	Male	Female	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Pacific Islander	Hispanic	African American	White	Other/ Multiple
Ed. Admin.	28	43	0	6	0	27	22	35	2
Multicultural	5	58	5	5	0	53	11	11	10
PPS	36	56	4	8	4	28	12	32	4
Teaching Curriculum	11	66	0	6	0	17	31	34	12
TBE	44	44	0	0	0	0	11	78	0

*Percentages do not add up to 100% due to respondents declining to respond.

Recruitment of undergraduate candidates is promoted through the Coordinator of the Liberal Studies Program and other single subject advisors. This is corroborated through interviews with faculty, administrators, and governance committees. The chair of TED and the initial program coordinators recruit initial program candidates by visiting undergraduate classes, attending pre-intern and intern fairs, working with the New Teacher Project, and collaborating with agencies that support career changers and collaborations with partner school districts. The advanced program coordinators recruit candidates from among alumni, public schools in the service area, and professional organizations and networks. The unit has state, federal and private grants that support the recruitment, retention and support of diverse candidates: CSU Diversity Funds, Aide to Teacher (ATT), Career Ladder, DOE Educational Leadership Grant, DOE Special Populations Grant, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Intern Grants (Multiple and Single Subject & Educational Specialist), Transition to Teaching, FIPSE: CCAT, and FIPSE: Immigrant Professionals. The units' good-faith effort to recruit, retain and support diverse candidates is clearly demonstrated in its Diversity Plan and results of recruitment.

Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

Table 40 provides diversity statistics for the school districts where initial and advanced candidates participate in field experiences and clinical practice. Like the faculty in local schools, PK-12 students reflect the diversity of the Greater Los Angeles Area and provide candidates with rich opportunities to work with diverse groups of students.

Table 40: Demographics of Partner School Districts Reported as Percentages

District	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian	Pacific Islander	Filipino	Hispanic	African American	White	Multiple	Free Reduced Lunch
ABC USD	.3	39.4	.7	8.0	38.4	10.3	15.50	0	35.1
Antelope Valley Union High	.7	1.7	.4	1.9	36.1	21.1	37.6	0.5	35.4
Arcadia USD	.2	62.2	.1	1.1	10.7	1.2	24.5	0.0	8.8
Baldwin Park USD	.3	3.4	.2	2.1	85.2	2.0	6.0	0.8	71.7
Bellflower USD	.4	4.0	1.4	5.3	47.2	15.9	22.3	.3.5	54.1
Centinela Valley USD	.6	8.7	.9	1.5	58.3	19.2	12.4	0	62.2
Compton USD	0	.1	.9	.1	68.8	29.2	.2	.7	95.1
Culver City SD	0	12.8	.7	1.8	36	21.3	29	0	32.2
Downey USD	.4	4.2	.3	1.3	75.6	4.0	14.1	0.1	53.1
East Whittier Elementary	.5	1.8	.5	.6	69.1	1.7	24.2	1.6	33.8
El Monte Union High	.1	16.9	.2	1.1	77.0	0.6	4.1	0.0	87.9
El Rancho USD	.2	.5	0.0	.6	95.9	0.4	2.0	0.3	66.6
El Segundo USD	.2	6.5	1.3	1.3	15.0	4.2	71.4	0.3	10.1
Glendale USD	.2	13.4	.1	5.0	22.4	1.0	57.0	0.8	44.2
Gorman Elementary	1.2	4.7	.5	1.1	21.9	15.4	55.1	0.2	48.5
Hacienda La Puente USD	.4	14.1	.4	2.1	72.6	2.8	7.4	0.2	59.4
Hawthorne Elementary	.1	2.8	1.6	1.9	62.8	19.2	12.4	0	84.2
Hermosa Beach City Elementary	1.0	7.7	.2	1.4	11.8	1.3	75.4	1.2	4.2
Inglewood USD	0	.4	.5	.2	56.7	41.8	.6	9	54.2
Keppel Union Elementary	1.1	.7	.2	.4	52.8	10.8	32.8	1.2	76.5
La Canada USD	0.0	23.8	0.1	.3	3.2	0.2	68.8	3.6	0.7
Lancaster Elementary	0.7	1.1	.2	1.8	36.9	29.1	30.2	0.0	61.4
Las Virgenes USD	0.2	6.8	.1	.7	5.4	1.7	83.5	1.5	2.9
Lawndale SD	.5	6.6	.1.2	1.3	68.6	20.20	12.40	.1	80
Lennox SD	0.1	0.0	0.9	0.2	95.6	4	1	0	85.3
Little Lake Elementary	.1	2.5	.3	1.4	82.0	3.7	9.5	0.6	65.8
Long Beach USD	0.3	9.7	2.0	3.4	49.0	20.3	18.9	0	65.5
Los Angeles Co Office of Education	0.3	3.4	0.5	0.9	52.5	25.7	15.4	1.3	63.5
Los Angeles USD	.3	3.8	0.3	2.1	72.5	11.8	9.1	0	76.5
Los Nietos Elementary	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	94.0	1.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Lynwood USD	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	90.1	8.8	.3	.4	55.8
Manhattan Beach USD	0.1	7.0	0.3	0.5	6.6	1.1	72.7	11.7	4.8
Montebello USD	0.1	3.5	0.1	0.3	93.0	0.4	2.6	0.0	77.7
Mountain View Elementary	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.3	91.7	0.3	1.0	0.4	82.0
Norwalk-La Mirada USD	0.4	4.6	0.8	2.8	70.7	4.3	16.5	0.0	51.5
Palos Verdes Peninsula USD	0.0	25.9	0.4	1.5	3.9	1.6	66.1	0.6	1.6
Paramount USD	0.2	1.3	1.1	0.8	82.5	11.5	5	.01	86.4
Pasadena USD	0.1	1.9	0.3	1.2	54.1	26.0	15.7	0.5	63.7
Redondo Beach	0.5	9.0	0.8	1.8	24.1	6.1	57.0	0.7	20.3

USD									
Santa Monica-Malibu USD	0.3	5.8	0.2	0.3	27.3	8.3	57.8	0.0	24.5
South Whittier Elementary	0.5	1.0	0.2	0.9	91.5	0.9	5.0	0.0	80.0
Torrance SD	0.7	31.3	1.0	3.2	18.1	3.9	47.7	0	16.4
Walnut Valley USD	0.1	53.0	0.3	5.1	18.5	4.2	18.7	0.1	10.3
Whittier City Elementary	0.3	1.0	0.2	0.3	87.2	1.0	7.4	2.6	51.3
Whittier Union High	0.4	1.6	0.2	0.9	77.1	1.7	17.8	0.3	36.2
Wiseburn Elementary	0.0	3.7	2.0	3.0	52.7	14.0	24.2	0.3	39.8

All initial and advanced candidates are required to do field and clinical experiences with PK-12 students from diverse backgrounds in these school districts. Program coursework and field experiences are designed to prepare candidates to effectively meet the needs of those students by increasing candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions. These are assessed in fieldwork using the student teaching/fieldwork/direct teaching assessment instruments, cooperating teachers and supervisors surveys, and portfolios or notebooks and capstone experiences, and candidates' evaluation of the program. Interviews with initial and advanced candidates, graduate, employers and supervisors reveal that they believe their programs prepare them well to work with diverse PK-12 students.

Table 41 lists items from these surveys that relate to diversity knowledge, skills, and dispositions. In the Teacher Education Exit Surveys, the following data provide evidence that initial candidates perceive themselves as being well prepared.

Results from the graduate and employer surveys show a high percentage of satisfaction among graduates and employers on items related to diversity knowledge, skills and dispositions (see Tables 42 and 43).

Table 44 lists items from these surveys that relate to diversity-related knowledge, skills, and dispositions of candidates from advanced programs. In the Graduate Education Exit Surveys, the following data provide evidence that advanced candidates perceive themselves as being well prepared. Table 45 reports data from graduates and employers.

**Table 41: Selected Items from Teacher Education Data from Candidate Exit Survey
Aggregate, 2000-2004**

Rating (%) of Teacher Preparation (CSTP Domains)	Fall 2000-Fall 2002	Spring 2003-Spring 2004
The program prepared me to:	% agreement	% effectiveness
1. Use a variety of instructional strategies and resources to respond to students' diverse needs.	73	75
3. Establish an environment that promotes fairness, respect, and group responsibility.	74	80
7. Draw on and value students' backgrounds, interests, prior knowledge, and developmental learning needs.	72	77
12. Communicate with students, families, and other audiences about student progress.	55	60

Table 42: Selected Items from Teacher Education Data from Graduate and Employer Surveys Aggregate, 2001-2003

Graduate and Employers Survey		
Teacher Preparation (CSTP Domains)		
G= Graduates; E=Employers	% agreement	
The program prepared me/the CSUDH graduate:	G	E
1. To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations	75	82
6. To meet the standards in the profession	66	72
8. To be effective at promoting student learning	68	76

Table 43: Selected Items from Special Education Data from Graduate and Employer Surveys Aggregate, 2001-2003

Graduate and Employers Survey		
Educational Specialists (CSTP Domains)		
G= Graduates; E=Employers	% agreement	
The program prepared me/the CSUDH graduate:	G	E
1. To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations	71	70
6. To meet the standards in the profession	81	75
8. To be effective at promoting student learning	92	80

Table 44: Selected Items from Graduate Education Data from Exit Survey Aggregate, 2001- 2004

Candidates' Exit Surveys (% Agreement)							
The program prepared me:	CUR	MUL	TBE	PPSSC	PPSSP	EAD	SPE
To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations	58	79	66	87	72	85	76
To be confident, responsive, and supportive in interactions with parents and community.	52	71	N/A	85	45	77	69

Table 45: Selected Items from Graduate and Employer Surveys Aggregate, 2001-2003 Related to Diversity

Graduate and Employer Responses (%Agreement)										
Programs G= Graduates; E=Employers	MUL		CUR		PPSSC		PPSSS		EAD	
The program prepared me/the CSUDH graduate:	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E	G	E
To meet the educational needs of urban and diverse populations	70	88	70	100	87	80	64	100	67	90
To be confident, responsive, and supportive in interactions with parents and community.	57	88	40	84	74	87	64	100	56	81

Overall Assessment of Standard

The team judges the standard to be met. Members of the College and University have designed and implemented an exemplary Diversity Plan. Knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity are carefully infused into the design and delivery of the curriculum in all programs; provide for interaction with a diverse full-time and adjunct faculty; are in a context of working with a diverse group of fellow candidates; and, are in a context of many and varied communities that provide an array of diversity.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 5: Faculty Performance and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Qualified faculty

The programs offered in the COE at CSU are at the graduate level. The Professional educational faculty and clinical faculty possess the academic credentials and professional experience qualifying them to teach in their areas of expertise. Archival data and current faculty vitae reveal that all tenured and tenure-line faculty members hold appropriate terminal degrees. As can be seen in Table 46, of the 67.5 full-time faculty in COE, 58.5 (86%) hold doctorates.

Table 46: Full-time Faculty in COE Departments in AY 2003-2004

N=Number of faculty at that rank	GED		PER		TED	
	N	Doctorate	N	Doctorate	N	Doctorate
Professor	14	14	3.5*	4.5*	9	9
Associate Professor	5	5	1	1	6	6
Assistant Professor	7	7	2	2	10	10
Lecturer	0	0	1	0	9	1
TOTALS	26	26	7.5	6.5	34	26

* Mid-year retirement.

The non-tenure track faculty (full-time lecturers) and adjunct faculty (part-time faculty) who serve as instructors, clinical supervisors, and field experience supervisors who do not possess doctorates have master's degrees and extensive experiences in PK-12 schools. The faculty who teach methods courses have teaching experience and certification in their content area that is verified by vitae, references, and degree which is done by the university at the time of employment.

There are 137 part-time instructors who teach courses in their areas of expertise and 128 supervisors that supervise field and clinical experiences in their area of certification. Part-time faculty members are hired based on their qualifications to teach selected courses and supervise clinical and field experiences. Part-time faculty members are highly qualified in their content areas and have many years experience as practitioners in our partner school districts, agencies, and special education and early childhood practicum sites. They are all certified in their assigned content areas (courses and supervision). Clinical faculty members are required to have certification in the area of supervision. This documentation is required in the hiring process and archived in faculty files housed in the COE. The qualifications of the faculty who teach in the initial and advanced programs are reviewed annually by the faculty of the RTP committees.

All teaching faculty in the unit have at least three years of teaching experience in the P-12 school system. Faculty members at all ranks provide instruction and supervision to candidates in PK-12 settings. A review of faculty vitae document that faculty participate regularly in school settings,

supervising candidates, providing professional development workshops for PK-12 teachers, and working on special projects. A few examples are summarized in Table 47.

Table 47: Examples of Faculty Contemporary Professional Experiences in School Settings

Division of Teacher Education (Initial Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Literacy Institute conducting PD training in K-12 districts (N= 4) • Employed as Teacher in Los Angeles basin district (N=7) in the last five years • Consulting on the topic of Book Ends, Establishing School Libraries, Compton Unified School District • Conducting Coach Training in Professional Development Schools (N= 5) • Critical Friends Coach Facilitator • ELD Staff Development, LACOE • CFASST Trainer, Toward Equity Trainer • Mathematics Instruction Staff Development, LAUSD • MASTEP District K, LAUSD • Founder of Charter School, CLAS • History Social Science Subject Matter Project • SCALE Project, Science , LAUSD, District I • SCALE Project, Mathematics, LAUSD, District G & I • Staff Development:, Do the Math!, LAUSD, Local District J • BTSA, Lynwood Unified School District • Writing Staff Development, Montebello Unified School District
Pupil Personnel Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interactions w/ fieldwork site supervisors, area directors, board of advisors (who are public school employees). • Violence Prevention Workshops • Consulting with School Districts
Educational Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational Leadership Partnership Program • Accountability Workshops with Compton Unified
Multicultural Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CLAD Training for Torrance Unified SD
TBE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education and Technology Presentation with LAUSD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beta Testing for Software
Teaching/Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Board Pre-Candidacy Support Cohort, LAUSD

Modeling best professional practices in teaching

Faculty members have deep understanding of their discipline and the ability to meld research into instructional practices. Faculty vitae document faculty preparation. Faculty content expertise is ensured through the hiring process, student feedback on question one of the PTEs, faculty mentoring, and coordination of syllabi for multiple sections of each course. In the hiring process, the position description establishes the criteria and the search committee, division chair, and dean scrutinize candidates' qualifications by reviewing evidence presented in a set of intensive interviews, the candidates' presentation, three recommendations, and degree verification.

Faculty have reviewed and aligned curricula with the CF toward the goal of preparing the Reflective Urban Professional. In scholarship and teaching, faculty members focus on the following four items:

1. the needs of diverse learners in urban settings;
2. PK-12 student performance assessment;
3. standards-based and performance-based teaching and learning; and
4. use of technology in the delivery of instruction.

Faculty members demonstrate that they value candidate learning by teaching and modeling best practices. A review of faculty vitae and faculty surveys provides evidence of use of portfolios,

examinations, case studies, reflective inquiry, simulations, cooperative learning, technology demonstrations, research projects and class presentations. In a recent survey, faculty stated that they used the instructional practices summarized in Tables 48 and 49.

Table 48: Instructional Strategies Practiced as Documented in Faculty Survey, 2004

Items	Yes (%)
Rhetorical Questions	79
Questions for critical judgment and/or reflective or analytical decision making	98
Advanced organizers	91
Small group discussions	93
Demonstration/modeling	93
Problem-based learning	90
Differentiated instruction	88
Brainstorming	91
Role-playing and simulations	81
Peer observation and feedback	74
Guest speaker	56

Table 49: Technology Tools Used by Faculty and/or Candidates

	Instructor Used%	Candidate Used%
Technology infused lesson plans	27	32
Online instruction as part of the coursework	22	22
Creating sound technology plans for a school/district	3	3
PT3 grant produced CD-ROMs	14	16
Applying copyright and legal policies	16	14
Designing and delivering professional development of staff in instructional technology	11	3

Some examples of class embedded technology instruction and requirements are:

- TED 412: Elementary Social Studies Methods. Candidates learn to use database development in a unit on immigration in which children do family history research;
- TBE 550: Candidates create a technology plan for a school. TBE 550 is now aligned with *NETS for Administrators*;
- MUL 521 , MUL 520: Candidates use the Internet for web-based research and to download material for instructional planning;
- CUR 510, 510, 516, 519: Candidates use databases, spreadsheets, and graphing software to organize information and draw inferences from data; and
- GED 500: (Required of all M.A. candidates) Candidates learn about and use appropriate discipline software applications, e.g., SPSS.

Faculty members use multiple modes of assessment and teach candidates how to create and use assessment instruments. As described in Standards 1 and 2 for initial programs, this includes case studies, performance tasks, rubrics, and portfolios. An examination of course syllabi shows specific criteria for assignments and/or projects in the form of rubrics. For advanced programs, rubrics are also used for the culminating experience (comprehensive examination or thesis) examination/thesis rubrics are posted on the GED programs' Blackboard communities or distributed with review material so that candidates can benefit from detailed expectations.

Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

CSUDH expects faculty to be active in scholarship, research and or creative activity. The Faculty Handbook for the university defines scholarship and the TED and GED divisions have their own definitions of scholarship.

Each department defines research and scholarly activity. The RTP process allows tenured and tenure track faculty the opportunity to develop their intellectual pursuits that relate to their teaching area, research that impacts that teaching, and service to the unit and university and further establishes the parameters of how this scholarly work effects their students, the department, the unit, the university, and the local community. Faculty members demonstrate how their scholarly activities connect to their own knowledge construction and reflection on their teaching practices.

In addition to publication, modeling of best professional practices in scholarship is also reflected in the faculty's success in securing external funding for research and training. Table 50 illustrates the number and amount of grants over a five-year span. Notable among these are: DOE Special Education Grants, DOE Leadership Grant, the FIPSE: Collaboration to Credential All Teachers, FIPSE: Immigrant Proposals, Transition to Teaching, and the CCTC University Intern Grants.

Table 50: COE Grants and Funded Projects 1999-2004

Year	Number	Amount
1999-2000	33	\$6,000,000
2000-2001	27	\$8,736,211
2001-2002	39	\$8,899,194
2002-2003	49	\$10,330,911
2003-2004	22	\$4,743,328

Scholarly work of the unit and individual faculty members is both diverse and extensive in its application to teaching and learning. Scholarship is closely related to teaching. As documented in faculty vitae and course syllabi, faculty members teach courses within their specialty areas. As teacher-scholars, they contribute to the advancement of the scientific literature and professional practices in their disciplines and integrate advances in their disciplines into their instructional practices. This includes: awards for scholarship, publications in professional refereed journals, monographs, books, chapters in books, presentations at international, national, state, and local conferences; reports, manuals, and handbooks at university, unit, and department levels; submissions for publishing and proposals for presentations; unit and faculty grant writing and funding; participation in university, unit, and department colloquia and scholarly discussions. There was a deep concept of scholarship related to learning because it enables research to improve teaching practice articulated in interviews.

A summary of faculty scholarship includes: 28 faculty members produced 68 refereed journals/book chapters, one faculty member published a book or textbook, 3 faculty were involved in four reviews, 19 faculty produced 50 association publications, 16 faculty did 38 local presentations, 23 faculty did 69 state/regional presentations, 33 faculty made 119 national presentations, and 9 faculty made 20 international presentations. Grant activity has been very productive with 23 faculty writing 134 grants totaling \$37,322,907.

Modeling best professional practices in service

In support of the unit's CF and the university and COE mission, service is of primary importance for faculty. Service is one of the required components of the tenure protocol. Faculty members are required to do service at the department, college, university, professional, and community levels. Faculty members are committed to the University's threefold mission to create a "communiversity" characterized by teaching, research, and service. All faculty members who teach in the credential programs provide service in a variety of educational settings.

There is extensive faculty service at the university level including WASC reviews, Strategic Planning, Faculty Affairs, RTP, Budget and Finance, University Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, and University Committee on Educator Preparation (UCEP). Faculty service at the unit level includes NCATE, CCTC preparation as well as committee membership in RTP, COE Evaluation Committee, and COE Curriculum Committee. At the division level, faculty service includes department and program specific committees such as RTP, curriculum and faculty searches as well as cross-program ad hoc groups involved in activities such as reviewing department processes and curriculum/program development. Faculty provide direct services to candidates by holding orientation and advising sessions, maintaining web-based information sites, supervising independent studies and theses, and monitoring and evaluating comprehensive examinations.

Faculty service takes many forms, including serving as faculty liaisons to the Professional Development Schools, collaborating on research or professional development activities with educational professionals and parents, developing and evaluating programs, and serving on advisory/improvement and other committees in schools. Faculty regularly volunteer in elementary and secondary school classrooms, provide assessment and diagnostic services, provide professional development for inservice teachers, and teach lessons and/or units in local schools.

Faculty contribute to the professional community by serving on editorial boards, as editors of professional publications, and as officers in organizations. Vitae document the number and kinds of service activities in which the faculty model best professional practices in service. Faculty serves as editors for the following journals: *Behavior Disorders*, *Issues in Teacher Education*, *Teacher Education Quarterly* and as members on refereed journal editorial boards.

In addition, faculty members serve as board members or committee chairs for a number of national professional organizations and state organizations, including the California Council on Teacher Education. Faculty are members of the following international, national and state professional organizations: AERA, CERA, NRC, IRA, CRA, AACTE, CCTE, ACSA, AASA, ASCD, NAESP, CAPEA, NARST, AETS, CSTA, CEC, CCBBD, NEA, CTA, ISTE, ASTUTE, CUE, AAHPERD, CAPSE, NCTM, NCTE, ACTFL, NCCS, CACCS, NAME, NABE, CABE, TESOL, CATESOL, CASC, CACD, APA, ACA. Faculty members also serve on the boards of directors for several non-profit organizations.

Collaboration

Unit faculty collaborate regularly and often with educational professionals from the PK-12 schools, faculty from other units on campus, and other members of the professional community dedicated to improving teaching. Collaboration is a key component of the COE CF and is goal four of the Strategic Plan. Table 51 lists some of the collaborative activities reviewed during the site visit. This collaboration is instrumental in improving teaching, candidate learning, and

teacher education. Candidates are integrally involved in these initiatives. Faculty members supervise candidates in the field on these projects and reported that this experience served to enrich their own teaching.

Table 51: Sample of Collaboration

Collaboration Activity	Participants in Addition to Unit Faculty	Level
Development of Professional Development Schools (MS, SS, ES)	PK-12 teachers and administrators, candidates	Initial
Educational Leadership Project	PK-12 administrators, candidates	Advanced
Title II Project development	Mathematics and Science Faculty	Initial
Academic Literacy Initiative	PK—12 Teachers	Initial
Future Teachers Association	Candidates, all colleges, future candidates	Initial
Liberal Studies Advisory	All deans, faculty from all colleges	Initial

Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

The unit promotes a triangulated process for collecting and analyzing data to evaluate the work of the unit and faculty. Examination of the performance of faculty is conducted through two formal means: Perceived Teaching Effectiveness (PTE) Surveys and the Retention, Tenure, Promotion (RTP) processes. The PTE surveys are administered to candidates for all classes delivered each semester. Formal evaluation for all faculty undergoing promotion and tenure are prescribed by the university and endorsed by faculty organizations, as well as the CSU Chancellor's office and are performed annually by special faculty committees. Faculty files are reviewed at four levels within the COE: Department RTP Committee, Department Chair, COE RTP Committee, and Dean. Independent reports are written at each of these levels and are forwarded to the next levels of review, the University RTP Committee, the Provost, and the President. The results of these reviews are intended to clearly establish the faculty member's performance and qualifications in each of three areas: teaching, professional scholarship and research, and service. The process is the same for all faculty members. For faculty who have been tenured and promoted, reviews of a similar nature (post-tenure review) are undertaken every five years. The COE faculty members perform favorably when compared to the CSUDH faculty as a whole on the campus required PTEs.

Consistent with the unit's CF, the faculty review for RTP is to: recruit and retain diverse faculty of the highest quality, assist in the career development of junior faculty by providing them with formative constructive feedback, and to advance the mission's unit with regards to teaching, scholarship and service. Each division has developed its criteria for faculty review in alignment with the CF and the university mission.

Unit facilitation of professional development

In keeping with the mission, beliefs, goals, and objectives of the unit to prepare the reflective urban professional, faculty are provided numerous opportunities to enhance their professional development. Generally, faculty members at all ranks have opportunities to engage in continued professional development to maintain and enhance their qualifications. In times of financial difficulty, resources are first targeted to junior faculty. The university provides sabbatical leaves every seven years. The Center for Teaching and Learning provides curriculum development research grants to faculty on a competitive basis. In addition, the Dean of the College offers mini-grants to support research and professional travel when such funds exist. The departments

and programs provide faculty development to support curriculum change. Indirect costs from external grants have contributed to faculty development, as well.

The knowledge assets that already exist in the COE are frequently tapped for training sessions for colleagues. Computer/technology experts in the COE have been instrumental during the past four years in preparing TED faculty for infusion of technology in all TED classes, as required by state mandate. Other examples include the training sessions provided to staff and faculty by the COE Analyst Programmer; training on the use of software by the COE Technician Specialist, evaluation design and implementation sessions provided for program faculty by the COE Director of Evaluation and the Evaluation Technician.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit faculty members have extensive academic backgrounds, with 86% of the full-time faculty holding doctorate degrees. The Unit faculty members are effective teachers who model best teaching practices in their areas of specialty. They are productive in many scholarly areas and provide service to the university, the unit and the community. All non-tenured professors are systematically evaluated using the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) procedure. All tenured professors are required to participate in a post-tenure review every five years. COE faculty serve on committees and boards at the university and in the community. They are also involved in local, state, and national professional organizations.

C. NCATE Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Unit Leadership and Authority

The preparation of educational professionals is a shared institutional responsibility of the California State University, Dominguez Hills, as evidenced by the university's mission statement and the collaboration of the Colleges of Education, Liberal Arts, Natural and Behavioral Sciences, and Health and Human Services in this endeavor. The president of the university provides the leadership and vision for the university as a whole, the provost oversees the implementation of that vision through the Division of Academic Affairs, and the dean of the COE (who reports to the provost) is the unit head for initial and advanced programs.

As documented by university policy, the COE dean is the designated head of the unit. The COE Cabinet, the unit's leadership team, is responsible for the overall governance of the college and for the planning, oversight, management, delivery, and the operation of all programs related to the preparation and continuing development of educators. The team is comprised of the dean, associate dean, fiscal manager, Director of Development, chair of the Graduate Education Division, chair of the Teacher Education Division, and coordinator of the Liberal Studies program. Their roles are summarized as follows:

- The dean holds broad responsibilities in the area of budget, faculty/staff, curriculum, fund raising, and external representation of the college;
- The associate dean is responsible for all matters related to candidates that reach the dean's office level, facilities/faculty offices, equipment, and research/grants development, and stands in for the dean, as designee, as appropriate;
- The fiscal manager also serves as the human resources manager and is responsible for all matters relating to budget/budget development, along with the dean, and for all faculty contracts and other matters related to the hiring of faculty/staff and the oversight of fiscal expenditures and for all matters related to the staff of the college and serves as immediate supervisor of the COE staff; and
- The director of development is responsible for all matters related to the raising of funds through personal and business/organizations, is the college's liaison with the Office of University Advancement, and along with the dean, works with the dean's resource development council.

The instructional deans, chairs, program coordinators, and faculty from subject matter programs/content areas are central to the functioning of the University Council for Educator Preparation (UCEP). The UCEP addresses teacher education issues and provides university-wide support and coordination of large efforts related to teacher preparation. The UCEP is the mechanism by which input from all other colleges is systematically infused into the unit's decision-making. UCEP meetings are held on a monthly basis.

The college is organized into three formal governance groups; the COE Cabinet, the COE Council and the Staff Council. Membership and meeting attendance of these groups are described in Table 52.

Table 52: COE Governance Structure

Group	Membership	Meeting Frequency
COE Cabinet	Dean	Weekly during academic year
	Associate Dean	
	COE Fiscal Manager	
	Division chairs	
	LBS Program Coordinator	
	Director of Development	
COE Council	Dean	Monthly
	Associate Dean	
	COE Fiscal Manager	
	Division Chairs	
	LBS Program Coordinator	
	Director of Urban Literacy Research Institute	
	Director of Development	
	Director of Evaluation	
	Program Coordinators	

Group	Membership	Meeting Frequency
	Credentials Analyst	
	Admissions Unit Lead	
COE Staff Council	Fiscal /Human Resources Manager	Weekly with Student Services Staff
	Full-time COE staff	Monthly with Division/Program Staff

The COE seeks input from external advisors. The COE through its mission and goals is dedicated to the service of, and within, the surrounding urban community. The COE Advisory Board comprised of prominent community members who are superintendents of public school districts, administrators of community colleges, and CEOs of local Los Angeles Basin reform agencies, advises the COE and serves as the Educational Administration Advisory Board. In addition to the COE Advisory Board, the Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, and the Multiple and Single Subject programs also maintain advisory boards composed of community members, college personnel, and others who are equipped to review the functioning of programs and provide useful critique and suggestions for enhancements and planning for the future.

Others who assist in providing external support for COE programs and candidates are the members of the COE's Resource Development Council. Members of the Resource Development Council are prominent political leaders from the community and other individuals who are in positions of prominence and who can exert this influence on friends and business associates to participate in fund-raising activities of the COE.

All unit publications and catalogues clearly and consistently describe the recruiting and admissions policies of the COE programs. The materials, which include academic calendars and advising, counseling, and grading policies, are available in the CSUDH Admissions Office, Registrar's office and the COE. The unit also maintains a comprehensive website dealing with these policies.

GED and TED are both staffed with two secretarial/clerical positions and student assistants. The work of field placement support is carried out by a TED staff member who is knowledgeable in the intricacies related to field placement and supervision arrangements for student teaching and internships. The Liberal Studies Program has a faculty advisor to advise and assist with program management and orientation supported by the five academic deans' budgets. The program has one staff assistant. The Peer Advising for Liberal Studies (PALS) Center provides advising to potential and/or continuing candidates in the Liberal Studies department. Candidates in the upper division in the program offer advising support to new or beginning candidates. The PALS program, which began in 1999, has been supported through the CSU Diversity funds and is deemed highly successful in its advising processes for candidates.

As a result of findings from surveys conducted during the 1998 and 1999 academic years, the Student Services Center (SSC) was established to ensure a systematic process to serve candidates. The SSC has personnel service divisions made up of: Advisement, Admissions, and Credentialing. The admissions section is comprised of three staff members who receive and process all admissions applications for both the divisions of Teacher Education and Graduate Education.

The work of the credentialing section is conducted by three credential analysts and one credential assistant that process all requests for credentials by credential candidates in Teacher Education, Special Education, Educational Administration, and Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) credentials.

Personnel within each of the sections of the SSC work efficiently at their responsibilities related to paperwork/document processing. According to COE administration, they have been selected and retained in their positions based on an ability to interface well with potential and current candidates, solve problems in finding the most appropriate faculty member with whom to talk in instances of advising, and general program needs.

During the interviews conducted on campus, current and past candidates in all program areas at the initial level reported concerns about advising. The concerns that were expressed cut across multiple advising areas including frequent comments that advising was not accurate, consistent, timely or reliable.

Unit Budget

The 2004-05 projected operating budget for Academic Affairs is \$36,943,000. This amount represents general fund monies for expenditures of the salaries of faculty, staff, and administrators, operations and facilities. The major source of revenue for the general fund is the proportional amount of student fees returned to the campus by the CSU system and state appropriations determined annually by the legislature. The unit's budget compares favorably to similar units on campus and has consistently received 20% of the overall academic affairs college budgets over the last five years. All college budgets are developed using FTE to insure consistency and fairness. Budget allocations are determined through a series of processes covered under the Program Effectiveness Councils, the University Budget Committee, the Provost and the President. The unit supplements its budget through intern grants to support university intern supervision. Table 53 lists the resources from independent operations such as trust and grant funds that support the work of the college.

Table 53: Independent Operations Funds 1999-2005

Trust & Grant Funds	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	Projected 2004/05
	\$530,598	\$709,729	\$1,039,983	\$1,205,322	\$1,129,851	\$622,490

Since the last BOE visit in 1999, the university has enjoyed continuous growth and an increased budget until the state of California entered into a dramatic budget shortfall in the spring semester of 2003. For the COE, it was a time of dramatic enrollment growth accompanied by an increase in economic support. In the last two fiscal years, the CSU system has endured three dramatic budget cuts adding up to approximately \$400 million. CSUDH has lost 10% of its budget in the last two years. At the system level, the Chancellor has endeavored to shelter teacher education from the worst of the cuts. At the university level, the provost and the University Budget Council (UBC) have worked to protect the instructional budget from the worst of these reductions.

In the face of such urgency, the COE has been faced with difficult budgetary issues. All areas of expenditures have been reviewed and strategies were implemented to deal with the budget crisis. The college has continued to recruit and hire new tenure line faculty but made reductions in areas of travel funds, supplies and equipment expenditures. But, the unit's budget adequately covers both on-campus and clinical work necessary to prepare educators.

Personnel

Faculty workload policies are established by the CSU system, in negotiation with the California Faculty Association contract (a union representation). Within the CSU system, full-time tenure-line faculty are contracted to teach a 12-unit load and 3 units are allocated to advising, committee

work and other responsibilities consistent with the duties of a faculty member. All full-time lecturers are assigned a 15-unit teaching load, unless released through grant support for responsibilities related to specific project efforts. A review of faculty loads and discussions with faculty confirm that they are teaching a maximum of 12 credits per semester.

Supervision ratios vary according to the type of fieldwork. Student teaching uses a 2:1 unit formula and intern fieldwork uses a 3:1 unit formula. Development of assessments for courses is considered a part of course preparation and delivery while unit assessment and evaluation is part of the 3 units provided for committee work. There is no release time for the development or the teaching of on-line courses. Courses delivered by direct broadcast are assigned additional load if certain triggers are met. Faculty with special assignments or those working with grants are given reassigned time for those assignments. Faculty members are also released using state funds to assume administrative responsibilities such as coordinating programs or being chair.

To ensure that faculty can engage in teaching scholarship and service, the university limits overload work, which is conducted outside the CSUDH structure, to 25% of the faculty assignment. Faculty load is monitored each semester to ensure compliance with the university's faculty load policy.

Part-time faculty is used at a minimum to teach courses and provide supervision. Part-time faculty must have a master's degree. Part-time faculty members are required to use the approved departmental syllabus that includes the relevant connections to the conceptual framework. They must participate in an orientation session and are paired with full-time faculty for feedback on course design and implementation. The unit head reviews candidate evaluations for each course taught by each part-time faculty member each semester. The part-time faculty report extensive interaction with full-time faculty, including involvement in ongoing discussions of the use of unit standards and assessments. There are no graduate assistants on the CSUDH campus.

In 2003, a COE Fiscal Manager was added and the Staff Administrator Manager eliminated in July 2004. The COE staff increased from 20, in 1999-00, to 22 in 2003-04. There are 3 staff in the COE supported by grants funding, representing 13.6 of the total staff. There are sufficient administrators, support personnel, and student workers to maintain the programs offered by the unit. Currently, the COE employs 22 staff deployed across two divisions, the COE Student Services Center, the Dean's Office and the COE Centers and Institutes. Staff members in each of these locations are included in Table 54.

Table 54: COE Staff Members, by Department/Center/Institute/Unit

Location	Number of Staff
Graduate Education	2
Liberal Studies	1.5
Teacher Education	3
COE Student Services Center	9
COE Urban Literacy Research Institute	.5
Dean's Office	
• Administrative Support	3
• Evaluation & Data Analysis	2
• Technology	1

The unit provides many opportunities for professional development within the university and college structure. All new university faculty members are given a three hour release during the

fall semester and are required to attend five three hour professional development sessions to acquaint them to college teaching and the university structure.

All travel allotments are provided to departmental faculty on a request basis with junior faculty given priority status. The CSUDH University Center for Teaching and Learning also provides a \$500.00 travel allocation through a competitive grant process. Through grants, the unit is also able to supplement faculty travel.

Unit facilities

The classrooms, faculty offices, library/media center, and school facilities are adequate for the operations of the unit. All facilities on campus are accessible to those with physical disabilities. The unit is housed in several physical locations that include the following:

- The COE building, renovated in 1996 for the needs of the COE, houses most COE faculty in the TED and GED divisions;
- Building 5, Small College Complex was renovated in 2003-2004 to house the Student Services Center, the Liberal Studies Program, the COE Evaluation Center and the Institute for Urban Literacy Research;
- Educational Academic Complex, a temporary, portable facility, completed in 2001, to house grants projects for the COE; and
- Two smart classrooms are located in COE building.

Each tenure line and full-time faculty member is provided with an individual faculty office. Part-time faculty members share offices. Each faculty has a personal computer, printer, filing cabinet, telephone with voicemail and bookshelves in his/her office. The size of the office is determined according to a formula for the CSU system. Faculty and staff computers are upgraded on a 3-year cycle, through the support of the CSUDH Instructional Technology Department. All new hires are given a computer platform of their choice.

Contained in the COE building are a variety of academic special use classrooms and resources. This includes a computer lab with 30 new MAC computers that are fully web-interactive (COE 1117); the Weiss Urban Literacy Center, a curriculum library (located in COE 1120) which houses current curricular materials needed by candidates in the Teacher Education and Special Education preparation programs; a resource room in COE 1107 which has testing and evaluation materials needed in Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services, sources for assistive technology and is used for special COE meetings; a smart classroom (COE 1216) supplied with laptops for all candidates; a conference room (COE 1016) used for meetings of small groups from 10-14 people; a mailroom for faculty to receive mail, copy and collate documents, distribute informational materials; an indoor kitchen/eating area, that includes a second copier; and an outdoor patio where faculty and staff frequently eat lunch and/or hold informal meetings, and where formal gatherings, such as receptions of the COE are held.

Classes offered through the COE are taught in a variety of buildings across campus. This includes: South Academic Complex II and III, Small College Complex, Social and Behavioral Sciences, East Academic Complex, LaCorte Hall, Natural Science and Mathematics, and Welch Hall. Many of these spaces are smart classrooms, offering faculty the capability of linking the web/internet, showing film/video or operating computer equipment to provide PowerPoint and other software program support.

The strong technology support given to faculty has allowed infusing of technology throughout the curriculum and modeled by faculty in their teaching. Another outgrowth of this technology support, the special education program has developed a course in assistive technology for the Master of Arts in Special Education (moderate/severe) to be required beginning fall 2005.

Unit resources including technology

The unit receives adequate funding for programs to support candidate learning. The dean of the COE allocates resources to the COE programs so that candidates can meet professional standards and show that they are *Reflective Urban Professionals*. Each division and program has budget allocations and chairs are given the authority and responsibility for spending and maintaining their budget. External funding through grants has provided significant opportunities for flexibility in funding. Grant funding has permitted significant flexibility in designating unit expenditures in ways to enhance the ability of candidates to meet standards. Grant funds were used to create the SMART classroom in the COE building. University technology resources fully support development and maintenance of the online access to the UAS.

The CSUDH campus was completely re-wired during AY 2002-03 to provide CAT5 – 100 mps access in all offices and classrooms. In addition, over 24 classrooms were converted to “Smart Classrooms” campus-wide. There are also 12 computer laboratories, campus wide. Each lab offers a variety of software applications as well as access to the internet, laser printers, and scanners. The university has established new wireless areas on campus for students, faculty, and staff.

All CSUDH students have e-mail access, free of charge, through the Campus Pipeline, includes candidates enrolled primarily in PDS sites as well as advanced program interns. Many COE courses require candidates to submit assignments, conduct discussions, submit material into electronic portfolios, and other processes via use of the internet, specifically utilizing Blackboard.

A recent collaborative partnership with TeachScape has provided distance capability in two initial programs. Candidates in these classes, who are provided with laptop computers and internet linkages, are able to view streaming video clips demonstrating excellent tracking for each lesson segment of each course and are also able to respond to assignments or the professor’s questions using the distance capability provided through the TeachScape partnership.

All COE faculty members are supplied with the computer desktop package of their choice, high-speed online access and email services and other software and hardware. The online teaching platform across the university is Blackboard and the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers a wide variety of professional development modules to prepare faculty and staff to use this resource. The COE Computer Systems Technician installs all hardware and software and stands ready to upgrade and/or repair, as required.

The COE website has been redesigned and is maintained by the COE Evaluation Center working in conjunction with the associate dean, division chairs and program coordinators. All pertinent information related to the COE is included on the website, and secure access is also provided for special circumstances, such as class needs and the BOE/CCTC team members.

The CTL also offers other support to faculty through small research grants available on a semi-annual basis. Within the COE, Dean’s mini-grants are provided each year to support the research

efforts of faculty. The work of the faculty researchers is supported by the COE. The Director of Evaluation and her staff provide continuous support for statistical applications, data compilation and analyses for those engaging in research efforts. Additional support for research/grant-writing efforts is provided through grant consultants, hired each year by the COE dean's office, to work with individual faculty on grants writing activities. As part of the New Faculty Success Program, CTL offers the Faculty Success Certificate Program, a series of seminars focused on several core areas: Instruction and Assessment, Technology, and Enabling Success in the RTP Process.

Print and internet resources are available in the University Library housed in the Educational Resource Complex (ERC). The Library Dean has worked hard to ensure that offerings of primary use to the COE faculty and candidates are available in the university library. During AY 2003-04, the Library purchased testing materials for the COE's School Counseling, School Psychology, and Special Education courses, thereby ensuring that these materials were available for use by candidates in those programs. Annual records show a steady increase of library expenditures for resources in response to the needs of the unit (ER doc #S6E5.8).

Supporting the educational needs of COE candidates and faculty is a primary goal of the University Library. The university librarians provide direct services to faculty and staff that includes assistance in creating links for specific education index services to enhance the connection between the instruction and research. Existing education collections (in all formats) emphasize such subject themes as PK-12 educational practice, multicultural education, special education, and research on measurement/testing. As can be seen in Table 55, the past 5-year period of library expenditures for print and non-print materials reflects a significant transition from print to electronic products, especially core aggregator databases such as *Education Full Text* (Wilson) and *Academic Search Premier* (EBSCO). However, we continued to purchase some print book titles and subscribe to a core list of print education periodicals to provide support for the COE curriculum. On average, 140 book titles and 130 periodical subscriptions were acquired each year.

The University Library subscribes to 70 electronic databases and 23,560 electronic journals, many of which are relevant to the study of education. CSUDH students and faculty have access through these databases to 566 education journals, as well as hundreds of journals classified in areas such as sociology, psychology, and health of value to education candidates. The library makes available subscription-based versions of ERIC which provides links to full-text articles and ERIC documents. In addition to ERIC, the library subscribes to ERIC E*Subscribe, *Education Full-Text*, MAS Ultra-School Edition, PsycINFO, Sociological Abstracts, and the Physical Education Index. Full-text education journals are found in the following databases: *Academic Search Premier*, Emerald Fulltext, Health Source Nursing Academic, JSTOR, LEXIS-NEXIS Academic Universe, Literature Resource Center, Medical Library (Proquest), Project Muse, PsycARTICLES, Science Direct, Wiley Interscience Journals, and Wilson Omni Full Text Mega. The SFX linkage system allows users to access referenced articles whenever the database they are using does not provide the article. To access the resources from home, users must register their barcode identification numbers with the Library. CSUDH faculty and candidates benefit from the CSU system-wide library resources.

Table 55: Library Expenditure, Overall, and Specific to College of Education

	FY 98/1999	FY 99/2000	FY 00/2001	FY 01/2002	FY 02/2003
Total Institution Library					
Print Books	\$ 206,703	222,251	395,688	447,601	133,357
Print Periodicals	\$ 369,696	309,839	327,404	323,045	550,307
Non-print*	\$ 114,870	111,047	116,985	131,527	160,570
Educational Resources in Library					
Print Books	\$ 12,810	13,927	15,445	18,541	17,430
Print Periodicals	\$ 15,600	15,600	15,600	15,600	15,600
Non-print	\$ 9,314	20,063	22,277	28,849	30,888
Other					2,454

A resource for education candidates and faculty, the Weiss Center for Urban Literacy is also available in the COE building. The materials housed there include all those needed as curricular support materials for Teacher Education and Special Education candidates in the area of reading/literacy, social studies/history, mathematics and science.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit has clear leadership authority for the operation of teacher preparation programs with sufficient budget, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The unit has sufficient full-time, tenure track faculty and support staff to provide integrity, quality, and continuity of the programs. Many concerns were articulated by initial candidates and graduates regarding the accuracy, consistency, timeliness, and reliability of student advisement across all programs.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement:

New

1. *Data (surveys and interviews) indicate that advisement for initial candidates is not provided as consistent, accurate, timely, or reliable.*

Rationale:

Even though faculty were reported to be attentive to candidates for advising purposes, numerous candidates and recent graduates reported inconsistencies in information provided, frequently misplaced or lost materials, and, at times, a disrespectful attitude toward candidate needs by personnel in the student service center. Candidates acknowledged that recent changes have been made to bring about improvements in the advising system, however, many still reported inadequate services.

E. State Team Recommendation: Standard Met with Concerns

The team identified a concern related to elements of the CCTC Common Standard #6, "Advice and Assistance." A thorough review of surveys and interviews revealed that candidates are not provided with advisement consistently and effectively across all programs. Even though faculty advising was found to be attentive, numerous candidates and recent graduates reported inconsistencies in information provided, frequently misplaced or lost materials, and, at times, a disrespectful attitude toward student needs by personnel in the student service center. Students

acknowledged that recent changes have been made to bring about improvement in the advising system, however, many students still reported inadequate services. The team did find that in programs where candidates are brought together in cohorts, advisement is consistent, accurate, timely, and reliable.

Internship Issues for State Report :

Common Standards 1 and 2 – Leadership and Resources

CSUDH has an official agreement with each school district in which an intern is employed. The multiple subject and single subject programs have university intern agreements with 45 school districts and special education agreements with 29 districts. Each district provides each intern with a support provider, and when needed, resources above and beyond the agreement.

Common Standard 4 – Evaluation

Since 1988, the TED Advisory Board has guided the university intern program. Representing many constituencies, the board reviews program design, presents candidate and school district needs, comments on program implementation and makes suggestions for review or change. A recent program improvement from this group deliberation has been a change in the way cooperating teachers are remunerated.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

Upon acceptance, intern candidates are sent a letter which details requirements and deadlines as well as a specific listing of the courses and sections in which the intern must enroll during the first semester of the program. During the supervised fieldwork portion of the program regularly scheduled required meetings are held with the interns when each candidate receives up-dates on the status of his/her progress in the program, and there are opportunities for interns to seek guidance with their particular situations. Specific handbooks for the credential program are provided to each intern candidate. The handbook outlines the program and professional expectations and responsibilities and charts the course for completion of the credential program.

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

The selection of the site support provider is made with the assistance of the site principal. In LAUSD a professional development school model clusters intern candidates in specific schools and a PDS liaison helps to identify coaches, and professional development is provided by the district for the coaches.

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

Field Supervisors take on a special role for interns already teaching in schools. The university provides supervisors with quality training a minimum of once an academic year and more often when new programs/ requirements are implemented, e.g., 2042, TPAs.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Multiple and Single Subject Internship Credential Multiple and Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis Credential

Findings on Standards

The team reviewed the institutional report and supporting documentation; additionally, the team interviewed candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners. Consequently, the team determined that all program standards are met for the programs reviewed.

Faculty in the College of Education (COE) encourage all candidates to adhere to high standards of professional conduct through course syllabi, classroom activities and personal models. Reflective essays, field performance tasks, signature assignments, formative and summative assessments, detailed programmatic rubrics, and portfolios allow faculty to assess and candidates to self-assess professional growth. The CSUDH COE conceptual framework guides the teacher preparation program. The framework governs the course work and field experiences which produce reflective urban professionals who bridge theory and practice.

The teacher education programs have an excellent process for preparing candidates for a preliminary credential. Candidates are given immediate and on-going formative and summative feedback on their progress and assistance in improving their pedagogical skills.

Strengths:

All aspects of the CSUDH teacher education programs are designed to prepare diverse candidates to serve the needs of diverse students in urban settings. Without exception, employers, candidates, staff, and faculty articulate this goal. The candidates are representative of the ethnic diversity of the CSUDH service area. Similarly, all selected school sites reflect the diversity of greater Los Angeles. Candidates are placed for their student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods meet the needs of diverse populations. The program defines diverse settings in the most inclusive possible context, going beyond traditional ideas to embrace individual needs.

The COE faculty have constructed a developmental sequence of course work and field experiences that enable candidates to reflect relative to the cognitive, social, emotional and physical needs of their students and determine appropriate instructional interventions based on sound assessment decisions. The Teacher Performance Assessment System (TPAS©) is unique and powerful instrument; the signature assignments, performance rubrics, and reflective essays encourage increasingly complex formative assessments for candidates' abilities. Systematic professional development activities in the use of assessment instruments have allowed the program faculty to experience a high level of interrater reliability. Candidates are mentored through this process by faculty providing relevant feedback, both in field assignments and on related written assignments for courses. The coherent structure of these experiences insure applied professional practices which best meet the needs of their students in the contemporary conditions of the urban schools in which they serve.

The placement process is candidate-friendly relative to the location of school sites. The dialogue between CSUDH placement personnel and their points of contact with LEAs is ongoing and collegial and indicates a very real collaborative partnership. University and school district personnel consistently strive to assure that the Multiple Subject candidates are placed in classrooms with highly competent and appropriately certified cooperating teachers that reflect the strong collaboration and effective coordination with the school districts. All methods faculty supervise candidates in the field setting. Candidates, master teachers, and site administrators express appreciation for the blending of theory and practice. Supervising practitioners and university supervisors commented on the high level of CSUDH candidates' commitment and dedication. CSUDH programs have a strong emphasis on content standards and pedagogical preparation for specific content instruction.

COE has been successful in recruiting faculty who have demonstrated recent success in K-12 instructional and leadership roles. These recent hires bring their expertise to the program to the benefit of CSUDH candidates. Additionally, adjunct faculty are experienced, current professionally, nurturing to candidates, and valued by CSUDH and school districts.

The outreach to academic departments and university committees in the development of subject matter programs exemplifies the university's collaborative spirit. This institution is also to be commended for incorporating candidate preparation for success in high stakes state examinations (i.e., CSET, RICA, CBEST) into comprehensive assistance efforts and authentic course assignments. Reaching beyond the university community, the institution has developed commendable partnerships with two Local Districts within LAUSD. This cohort model which establishes a centrally located professional development school in hard to staff districts creates a system that provides interns with necessary support and assessment.

CSUDH is to be commended for expanding its bilingual multiple and single subject programs and strengthening the primary language methodology and literacy components. The course assignments and requirements for the CSUDH bilingual programs remain consistent with the overall program philosophy of responding to the needs of a culturally and linguistically diverse community.

Concerns

None noted.

**Education Specialist Credential Programs
Mild/Moderate Level I Including Internship
Moderate/Severe Level I, Including Internship
Early Childhood Special Education Level I**

**Mild/Moderate Level II
Moderate/Severe Level II
Early Childhood Special Education Level II**

Findings on Standards:

Based on interviews with candidates, faculty, employers, graduates, supervisors, supervising practitioners and document review, the team determined that all standards were fully met with the exception of Standard 11 for Education Specialist Level II programs. Standard 11 was determined to be met minimally with quantitative concerns. Although candidates are able to include non-university activities in their Level II program, these activities are applicable only to the content of the Professional Individual Induction Plan and not to the content of the coursework for the Level II program.

Strengths:

Exemplary Credential Program Curriculum – The Education Specialist faculty members are to be commended for the high quality of their credential programs in the areas of Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities and Early Childhood Special Education. The curricula have a strong theoretical research-to-practice framework that prepares candidates to serve students with special needs in a variety of instructional settings. Course content is current, relevant, and represents the best practices in the fields of study. Candidates reported that the material learned from course lectures, activities and assignments were readily applicable to the classroom. The emphasis on the special needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students receiving special education services are threaded throughout the course content and field experiences. SB 2042 required extensive changes in Single and Multiple Subject program coursework; nevertheless, the faculty has successfully integrated the new general education content into the appropriate Education Specialist programs.

The credential programs have a broad range of exemplary field experiences in which candidates have ample opportunities to build their pedagogical skills in developmentally appropriate increments and to engage in ongoing critical reflection about their decision making. Program faculty employs multiple measures to evaluate candidate performance and to use these data for ongoing candidate growth and program improvement. Field supervisors provide timely feedback to student teachers and interns. Instructional plans for assisting these candidates developed by the field supervisors are shared with master teachers and support providers. Employers report that intern candidates and student teachers were well prepared for the rigors and challenges of day to day teaching, student assessment, appropriate program development, and evaluation.

High Caliber of Faculty – The accreditation team found compelling evidence that members of the Special Education faculty are hardworking, dedicated, and highly professional. Candidates reported that full- and part-time faculty members are generous in sharing their knowledge and

expertise both in the classroom and in the field. Because full-time faculty members also supervise candidates in the field, they are aware of the particular challenges of teaching students with various special needs. They respond to candidate requests for assistance in a timely manner.

Part-time faculty, field supervisors, master teachers and support providers are carefully chosen, provided with ongoing professional development, and invited to participate and collaborate as full partners in various program areas. There are multiple opportunities for collaboration among field personnel full and part-time faculty.

Beyond being exemplary teacher educators, this faculty is recognized for their various professional achievements. They are to be wholeheartedly commended for maintaining such high standards of practice in teaching, professional achievement, and scholarship. Faculty members have successfully obtained several impressive grants to recruit a pool of diverse candidates into the field of special education.

Quality of Teacher Candidates – Employers, field supervisors, master teachers, and support providers report that graduates and candidates of the program are well prepared, enthusiastic, extremely professional, and quickly become integral members of their respective faculties. Employers also report that the extensive field experiences candidate have during the credential programs results in special educators that enter the classroom with great confidence and competence.

Since candidates have the opportunity to take classes with individuals in the multiple subject and education specialist programs, opportunities to collaborate are abundant. The collaborative practices modeled in course seminars provide a framework for collaboration in field settings. Candidates are comfortable collaborating with general education teachers, parents, community, and other professional personnel in the development, implementation, and evaluation of programs. As a result, the students receiving special education services are educated in the least restrictive environment.

Concerns:

None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Counseling with Internship Child Welfare and Attendance

Findings on Standards:

After careful review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with candidates, interns, graduates, faculty, employers, and field supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Service Credential in School Counseling, School Counseling Internship and Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization Standards with the exception of School Counseling, Standard 31, Field Experience. This was minimally met with qualitative concerns.

According to the CCTC School Counseling Standard 26, “Candidates demonstrate in field experience the knowledge of and skills in working with pre-K through adult pupils in the areas identified in the standards for school counseling.” Evidence of a specific design for the Practica portion of the Field Experience Standard that supports the standards for school counseling was not evident. Conversely, the practica experience was aligned primarily with the Child Welfare and Attendance Practica Standard therefore, a complete practica experience where candidates focused on the areas identified specifically in the standards for school counseling was not evident. The institution has made a commitment to adjust the program to include a 100 hour Practicum, commensurate with Standard 31 requirements, effective at the next enrollment period.

Strengths:

- The School Counseling program has recently designed a sequence of courses and fieldwork experience to prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to promote the academic, career, personal and social development of culturally and linguistically diverse pupils. With this preparation, it is anticipated that graduates of the program will be able to design, implement and evaluate a school counseling program effectively, as well as demonstrate skills as leaders, counselors, consultants, and advocates for children and youth. The primary conceptual grounding includes an ecological and systems perspective to serve the multicultural population in schools.
- The candidates and graduates interviewed continually expressed appreciation for the availability, accessibility, and care provided to them. Faculty have an “open door” policy, where candidates feel very comfortable coming to them with questions and concerns.
- Candidates are provided the opportunity to prepare and use counseling strategies, and have knowledge of materials and activities that are appropriate for pupils with diverse needs, complex situations and a variety of interests.
- It was evident that the School Counseling program has a major emphasis on diversity. This is reflected in the composition of the students in the program, and is consistently articulated by faculty, students, supervisors, and employers. It is to be commended that the faculty has effectively utilized the composition of their diverse student body, coupled with diversity and multicultural emphases in coursework and classroom experience, giving students a unique educational experience that enhances their competency as future school counseling professional.
- Both candidates and graduates report satisfaction with the blend of theory and application. Candidates praised the faculty’s attention to their individual needs and many times gave credit to the faculty, crediting them for their success in the School Counseling Program.

- Candidates' competence is determined through multiple measures, including coursework assignments, feedback from fieldwork placements, individual reflection and from a comprehensive exit examination.
- Faculty encourages all students to adhere to high standards of professional conduct.
- Candidates and graduates report that the level of teaching in the department was high and appreciated the range of expertise and backgrounds of both fulltime and adjunct faculty members.
- The level of involvement of the adjunct faculty is to be commended; these individuals provide important instruction, supervision, and input that contributes tremendously to the quality of the School Counseling program.

Concerns

None noted

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology with Internship Child Welfare and Attendance

Findings on Standards:

After careful review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with candidates, interns, graduates, faculty, field supervisors, and employers the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Service in School Psychology, with the exception of Standard 26 (Culminating Field Experience). Standard 26 was met minimally with quantitative concerns.

Evidence of *specific and clearly written internship plans for field experience* (i.e., describing the objectives, evaluation, and supervisory responsibilities) required by Standard 26 was not evident during the review. It was apparent that this component was omitted in the original submitted program materials. Faculty developed an appropriate expansion of the previous fieldwork policies and it is understood that students beginning in the current School Psychology program will be provided appropriate documentation as delineated in CCTC standard 26 beginning Spring 2005.

The School Psychology program has a newly designed sequence of courses, practica, and fieldwork to prepare candidates with the knowledge and skills to promote the personal, social, and academic development of culturally and linguistically diverse students. With this preparation, it is anticipated that graduates of the program will be effective leaders, change agents, problem solvers, counselors, consultants, and advocates for children and youth. The primary conceptual grounding includes an ecological and systems perspective to serve the multicultural population in schools.

Strengths:

- Proactive improvements in the program during the past decade were noted by program faculty, graduates, supervisors, and employers. The evidence consistently indicates that the School Psychology program is receptive and responsive to feedback to enhance the preparation of candidates.
- It was clearly evident that the School Psychology program has a major emphasis on diversity. This is reflected in the composition of the candidates enrolled in the program, and is consistently articulated by faculty, candidates, supervisors, and employers.
- Involvement of the adjunct faculty is to be commended, these individuals provide important instruction, supervision, and input that contributes tremendously to the quality of the School Psychology program.
- Ample evidence demonstrates the quality of the collaboration between the University and school districts.
- Abundant evidence indicates that preparation regarding Assessment and Data-Based Decision Making is excellent, including knowledge of formal and informal test administration, socio-emotional and behavioral assessment, ecological assessment, as well

as other assessment methodologies to define a student's needs. There is particular emphasis on preparing candidates to use alternative assessments.

- Emphasis on the importance and understanding of curriculum and learning was also highlighted by all sources of information.

Concerns

None noted.

Administrative Services Credential Preliminary Professional

Findings on Standards

After a review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and employers, the team has determined that all program standards in all programs are met, with the exception of Standard 8 (Guidance, Assistance and Feedback), which is met minimally with qualitative concerns.

For Standard 8 (Guidance, Assistance and Feedback), the team found evidence that University fieldwork supervisors do not consistently coordinate the support and assessment of each candidate with school site supervising administrators. The evidence surfaced an issue with a large number of candidates who needed to be served, and a dwindling qualified faculty that had to handle an increased, unbalanced workload.

Candidates are taught in classes either in a cohort model off-campus at school sites in proximity to the University or on campus. They are exposed to a high quality, practical curriculum with strong technology and diversity components. Candidate competencies linked to the Program Standards are clearly evidenced through course syllabi, program documents, student work, and field experience. Administrative and leadership behaviors that lead to high student achievement are demonstrated by candidates and graduates of the program.

Candidates and graduates report that they are very satisfied with the blend of the theoretical and practical curricula offered by the Educational Administration programs (both Preliminary and Professional levels). Reflection on their work and site experiences is a beneficial cornerstone of the programs offered. The program focuses on preparing school leaders for significant roles in diverse urban educational settings.

Candidate competence is determined through multiple measures, including coursework assignments, candidate reflections, collaborative work, portfolios, and fieldwork feedback. The team has found that California State University , Dominguez Hills' graduates hold successful school leadership positions in the communities surrounding the University.

Strengths:

The Administrative Services Program is to be commended for its outstanding outreach to the communities it serves. It is responsive to large and small districts in the surrounding area and provides valuable collaborative partnerships with these entities. Particularly impressive is the implementation of cohort groups in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program (Tier I) funded by a three year Federal grant written by two University professors.

Candidates and graduates responded in glowing terms about the rigorous curriculum, which bridges the theoretical and practical applications necessary for success in school leadership positions. They also praised the caring, responsive and high quality faculty representing a blend of higher education and K-12 experience.

Concerns:

None noted.

Designated Subjects Credential Adult Education

Findings on Standards

Based on the review of the self-study and institutional report, examination of supporting documents, and interviews of program faculty, institutional administration, candidates, graduates, advisors, school administrators, credential analyst and advisory committee members, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Designated Subjects, Adult Education Credential Program.

Students receive the benefits of an enthusiastic and expert faculty, which is highly motivated and collaborative. They receive meaningful on-going evaluation, counseling and career guidance. As a result of the program, candidates develop pedagogical skills, and competencies modeled by their instructors.

The program focuses on the students and their needs in providing a personalized, professional training program delivered by the well-qualified instructors and supervisors. They are guided through the credentialing process beginning with an initial orientation followed by the application of appropriate professional skills while adhering to the standards.

Strengths:

The program is to be commended for its highly qualified coordinator and faculty whose expertise and dedication give students a quality educational experience. The cohesiveness of the faculty combined with their collaboration with the Extended Studies Program assures a quality program for all students. Together, the two entities are marketing partners for the Adult Education Program for future program development.

Concerns:

None noted

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

Common Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practices

This suggestion emerged from an interview with cooperating teachers when they were discussing the difficulties in traveling in rush hour to campus. The unit may want to consider the development of a University Liaison Teacher (ULT) role for sites where there are several interns or cooperating teachers. The ULT who would serve as something like a super coach would be responsible for providing professional development for other cooperating teachers and coaches. The ULT would go to the campus to learn the new observation techniques then be able to teach the other coaches/cooperating teachers.

Education Specialist

The team suggests that the institution explore creative ways to allow candidates to enroll in the final directed teaching so that they will not be delayed in completing the programs.

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling

- Because this is a period of transition, resulting from the recently developed School Counseling program under the new 2001 Pupil Personnel Service Credential Standards, it will be essential to establish unequivocal evidence that candidates are developing competencies in all CCTC standard areas. It is recommended that establishing a fieldwork plan that delineates specific activities for each of the training standards would likely benefit both the candidates and the supervisors. It is also suggested that consistently delineating CCTC standards in the course syllabi as related to the course objectives is recommended, and is a valuable strategy to clarify the link between coursework and training standards. Additionally, at the completion of each course and as a culminating activity, it is recommended that students complete a reflective assignment that addresses specific course competency and their perspective on the degree of proficiency and need for further training and/or field experience.
- It is important that the School Counseling program faculty be increased. Currently there are faculty members that have retired or are approaching retirement in the near future. While the Adjunct Faculty make important contributions to the program, an additional Full-Time Faculty member with a degree and a credential in school counseling is important to the ongoing success of the program.
- It is recommended that a stronger emphasis be placed on students' understanding of the content and purpose of the American School Counselors National Standards and the American School Counseling National Model. Additionally, intentional instruction that emphasizes standard professional terms and vocabulary generic to the school counseling profession is optimal. It is also suggested that candidates be required to acquire these documents for their personal reference library.

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology

It is important that the School Psychology program faculty be increased. Currently there is 1 Full-Time Faculty member with a school psychology credential While Adjunct Faculty make important contributions to the program, an additional Full-Time Faculty member with a degree

and a credential in school psychology is important to the ongoing success of the program. Given the instructional, advising, and professional demands of the School Psychology program, it is important to have a reasonable complement of Full-Time and active faculty with appropriate background and preparation.

Establishing a fieldwork plan that delineates specific activities for each of the training standards would likely benefit both the candidates and the supervisors.

Delineating CCTC standards in the course syllabi as related to the course objectives is commendable, this is a valuable strategy to clarify the link between coursework and training standards.

Having the reference library service the distribution of assessment materials appears to be an innovative solution to a complex challenge in managing these important resources.

Administrative Services Credential (Preliminary and Professional)

It is recommended that program faculty work toward establishing and monitoring a policy and practice of a standardized format for all syllabi. It was noted that some syllabi were not in NCATE format, nor did they contain CTC Standards. Furthermore, content in courses as expressed by goals and objectives varied within different sections of the same course.